

FILED DEPT.
1935
SECRETARIES

THE TRUTH AND SUPREMACY OF THE WORD OF GOD

Addresses delivered by Dr. C. G. Trumbull
and Dr. J. Gresham Machen at the Central North Broad
Street Presbyterian Church on Tuesday, October 8th,
1935, at 8:00 o'clock P. M.

SHORTHAND SERVICE BUREAU
EVERETT G. RODEBAUGH
LAW REPORTERS
TWELVE SOUTH TWELFTH STREET
PHILADELPHIA

Dr Mc Afee

Dr Stees

Returned by Dr Schell
with thanks.

Chas^r

H.L.

THE TRUTH AND SUPREMACY OF THE WORD OF GOD

Addresses delivered by Dr. C. G. Trumbull and Dr. J. Gresham Machen at the Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church on Tuesday, October 8th, 1935, at 8:00 o'clock P. M.

DR. TRUMBULL: A Christian woman had been teaching in a Sunday School in New York City some years. The Sunday School in which she was a teacher was that of a Presbyterian church, one of the best known Presbyterian churches in America. This Christian woman and Sunday School teacher who has been for years a friend of Mrs. Trumbull and myself believes the whole Bible, and she happened to be in a church and Sunday school where she knew the pastor and some others in places of authority in that church did not hold her convictions as to the Bible.

She was troubled about it, and one day she felt moved to go frankly to the pastor who, as I say, was a minister of one of the best known Presbyterian churches in America, and have a frank talk with him, friendly and informally, about her own convictions and

his own, and she said to him that she wasn't sure whether he would approve of what she was doing in the Sunday School of his church. She told him very frankly and honestly that she was teaching the children -- she was in charge, I think, of the junior department -- she was teaching the children the Bible as the word of God which she believed.

And he listened very tactfully and sympathetically, and when she finished she said to him, "I am not sure whether you would approve of this or not and I want you to know exactly what I am teaching in your Sunday school." And his reply was something like this: he said, "It is all right, Mrs. D. It is all right," he said, "I want you to go right ahead doing exactly as you are doing." He said, "I believe myself that we ought to tell the children the stories of the Bible just as they are given in the Bible, and then after they grow up let them be told the truth."

We smile at that, but there is a tragedy back of it, isn't there? And it is because of that position and that sort of thing which is going on not only in that particular Presbyterian church and Sunday school, but in many others that we are here tonight to look to the Lord and look to the word of God for what

he has to tell us about the topic that has been given to us this evening, "The Truth and Supremacy of the Word of God," and then to see what is happening in the church that we love, and not only in the Presbyterian church but in practically every Evangelical denomination of the world today.

Was that Sunday school teacher right in teaching those under her care in that Sunday school that the stories, that the incidents, that the lessons that she was giving them from the Bible were indeed the very turth of God?

Let us look for a few minutes at the question, for the whole Bible is the word of God. Perhaps you had your attention called to the fact that in three thousand, one hundred and twenty-five different passages of the Bible -- someone has made that count; others have it counted and made it somewhat larger than that, but in at least three thousand one hundred and twenty-five passages of the Bible such expressions are used, "As the Lord spake," and "God said," and "The words of God;" more than three thousand times. In other words, the Bible, itself, claims to consist of the actual words of God.

That is not man's opinion about it; that is

what the Bible says of itself, and either that is true or it is false. If it is false we are confronted with the fact that the Bible is a tissue of lies, is just a mass of falsehoods from Genesis to Revelations with more than three thousand falsehoods in it. If it is true, then the Bible is God's word, and we are confronted by a much greater problem or difficulty if the Bible is a mass of falsehoods to explain the obvious and utterly unique influence it has had throughout the world in the centuries of man's history than to recognize it as the word of God which explains everything in the marvelous way that this word has done.

Max Wright, a Hebrew Christian and member of the Society of Friends, called my attention one time years ago to the fact that the early Friends referred to the Bible not as the word of God but as the words of God, and he went even further, and called attention to the fact that in the chapter that was read to us tonight, II Timothy, the third chapter, in the fifteenth verse, you will recall Paul writes to Timothy that from a child he has known the sacred writings. The Greek word for that is Grama, or Gramatha; "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures," the authorized version gives, and the word translated is a Greek word gramatha

which means writings, so that there is what the word of God says concerning the Bible, that it consists of sacred writings.

Not only the words are the words of God, but the very letters making up the words have been divinely laid by the Holy Spirit on those upon whom the Holy Spirit came.

That Scripture lesson read to us tonight out of II Timothy, three; sixteen, says:

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

The Greek word means God's breath; all Scripture is God's breath. Such men as the late Dr. Warfield, and Bishop Lyle of the Church of England, and our beloved Dr. Thomas, who spoke to us in Philadelphia, all agree that the change that was made in the revised version changing II Timothy three:sixteen was entirely ^{was?} justified by the Greek, and we have it correctly in the King James' version: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for righteousness."

Has it ever occurred to you that if II Timothy three:sixteen is not literally true there is

another three:sixteen in the Bible concerning which we may not have an assurance, John three:sixteen?

II Timothy three:sixteen tells us that all the Scripture is given by/inspiration of God, and John three:sixteen tells us that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

And those two three:sixteens depend upon each other. We have no assurance that Christ is our Savior, the way of salvation is by believing in Him there in John three:sixteen if II Timothy three:sixteen is not also God's word.

So, we find over and over again the expression, "Word of God," in the Bible may refer either to Christ or to the Scriptures. We are born again, but not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth in the Bible forever.

Paul's letter to James says in the first chapter, eighteenth verse, "Of His own will begat he us with the word of truth," and in John first chapter and twelfth verse, "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God."

And so we have the Blessed revelation all through the New Testament, to those who received the

word, the incarnate word, the word which became flesh, which in the beginning was with God, and the written word which is living and powerful.

Borrow
I remember years ago hearing Dr. David J. Borrow as I was with him calling on him in his collegiate church in New York City emphasizing the marvelous parallels between Christ and the Bible. We have an infallible Christ and Savior; we have an infallible word and Scripture, and he called my attention then to what I have studied ever since then, the testimony and revelation given in the Scriptures of the marvelous parallels between Christ and the Bible.

I remember Dr. Borrow told me that morning in his study that he had been talking with a professor, a modernist professor of a modernist theological seminary about this, and he had called that theological professor's attention to the parallels between Christ and the Bible. It was quite new to the professor. Dr. Borrow opened up the subject as only he could out of a lifelong study of the word.

Finally, the professor said to him, "I see what you mean, Doctor; I see what you mean. You mean Christ and the Bible stand or fall together."

"No, no," said Dr. Borrow, "I said no such

thing. They stand together." He wasn't using the word, "fall," at all, of either the Lord or the Book.

And I have been thinking how appropriate it is tonight that we should be holding this meeting, getting together in a mass meeting of Presbyterians on, "The Truth and Supremacy of the Word of God," in a month in which the four hundredth anniversary of the first translation of the entire Bible in English is being celebrated.

On the fourth of October in 1535, Bishop Miles Coverdale, Bishop of the Church of England, finished or brought out the first printed English Bible. The Bible had been translated into English before that, but it is four hundred years ago this month that we had the first English printed Bible.

And so, dear friends, we are observing the four hundredth anniversary of one of the greatest blessings God has given to the English speaking world in giving us this precious book in our own tongue, which the English world has had for four centuries. We believe that the whole Bible, not parts of it here and there, but the whole Bible is the word of God. Many do not; many professing Christians do not; many teachers in seminaries training ministers do not, and many pastors

of churches do not.

But what difference does it make? Does it make any difference whether we believe that the whole Bible is the word of God, or that the Bible contains the word of God and that much in it is true, and yet men writing the Bible were permitted to make mistakes, as many people sincerely believe? Does denial of the word of God mean anything? What does it mean?

Yes, it means disaster. Any denial of any part of the entire word of God and the sixty-six books of the Bible means disaster, and it means, eventually, death, spiritual death instead of spiritual life.

The denial of the word of God, as you know, began way back in the Garden of Eden before man and woman had sinned, as God had told Adam and Eve they must not eat of a certain tree in the Garden of Eden, for the day thou eatest of it thou shalt surely die. Then the serpent came to Eve and said, "You shall not surely die," and we have the issue that is facing the Presbyterian church and all churches tonight. God says one thing and Satan says another thing. The Father of lies and sin deceived Eve; she led Adam into ^{the} sin that God had forbidden and death came, and it came from a denial of the word of God. Denial of the word of God makes God a

liar.

Turning over to the first Epistle of John, we read in the fifth chapter, tenth verse, "He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar."

And that is the sin of modernism, denying some part of the word of God, denying something which God says is so and man says it is not so, and man not believing in God makes Him a liar. Any departure, therefore, from belief in the whole word of God is fatal, disastrous. Why? For one thing it makes man the critic of the Bible.

The Bible is living, powerful and quickening. The Greek word is discerning of the thoughts and intents of our hearts.

It is substituting my subjective opinion for God's objective revelation which he has given us in this Book entirely apart from ourselves, of the truth He wants us to know.

The Atlantic Monthly some years ago published an article that I have made a quotation from, "The altered basis of religious authority." It says this, and this is what modernists believe; this is what that pastor of that Presbyterian church whom I quoted a moment ago believes ^{who} he said, "Yes, I think children ought

to be taught the stories of the Bible and then after they grow up let them be told the truth."

"The final basis of religious authority for you is yourself, your mind working on all that has come down in religious tradition of Christianity and selecting and making your own those things which fit the requirements of your intelligence, of your moral judgment, of your spiritual covenant."

That is a big step to take. This writer says, in other words, we are to open this Book which God says is his word, and we are to decide for ourselves what parts of it are true and what parts of it are false.

There is nothing new in modernism. The word modernism brings in the word modern, and modernists like to believe there is something new in their position. It takes us back to the Garden of Eden.

In Ezekiel, thirteenth chapter, second and third verses, God says: "Son of man, prophecy against the prophets of Israel that prophecy, and say thou unto them that prophecy out of their own hearts, here ye the word of the Lord; thus saith the Lord God; woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing!"

What an infallibly accurate description of the modernists of today, the foolish prophets who decide for themselves what is true and what is false in that which God tells us is His own infallible word; making ourselves, giving us a subjective decision concerning the Bible, what is inside of men will tell me whether it is true or false, instead of realizing that wholly outside of ourselves in an objective book which we can take in our hands and read God has given us truth which does not depend upon ourselves at all, thank God, but on his perfect revelation by His Holy Spirit.

Mr. Irving Linkton, that Christian lawyer who loves the Lord and the Bible, a lawyer who has practiced before the Supreme Court of the United States and who knows how to weigh evidence, said this in a letter to me a year or two ago concerning modernists and fundamentalists; he says the fundamentalists position has a hard clear objective foundation, and the position of modernists mixes up the subjective and objective as if it were the same -- that is, what is inside and outside as though they were the same. "They are like crazy people that I have had to send to the insane asylum," says this lawyer. That is exactly what God says.

Again, why is denial of any part of the word

of God disastrous? Many modernists tell us, "What we are simply saying is that certain historical statements in the Bible are not entirely accurate; we are simply saying that sometimes statements in the Bible that touch upon science are not entirely in accordance with what we now know scientific fact to be. But, of course, the spiritual truth in the Bible is all true," and they distinguish between historical, and scientific, and the spiritual.

Many years ago Professor Franz Davis, a German professor of theology, and commentator on the Bible who believed the whole word of God and all the fundamentals of the faith, said to his students in his classes:

"Young gentlemen, the battle is now raging around the Old Testament, the historical parts of the Old Testament. Soon it will pass into the New Testament field; it is already beginning. Finally, it will pass forward to the center of your faith, the birth of Jesus Christ, and the last struggle will occur."

I suppose it was seventy or seventy-five years ago that Professor Franz Davis said that to his theological classes in Germany, and he was a true prophet. He could see exactly where the higher criticism,

the so-called historical criticism of the Old Testament would some day eventually lead.

Here is a professor of our day, Professor George Jackson. What does he say about it? He says this:

"It is now admitted on all hands -- " thank God, it is not admitted in this get together tonight -- "It is now admitted that Christ's authority cannot be invoked to invalidate the findings of modern Biblical criticism; neither do we explain his language as an accommodation to the ignorance of his contemporaries. We must maintain the limitations of the knowledge of Jesus in the interests of a true Christology and of intellectual liberty."

In other words, we know more, says Professor George Jackson, than Christ knew; his knowledge was limited; we have gotten farther than he has. That is a startling confirmation of the clear prediction that Professor Franz Davis made perhaps three-quarters of a century ago.

Is it disastrous to deny any part of the word of God? Yes, not only in the case of the individual person, but in the second and third generations to those trained in the denial of the Book, and of the

authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, Himself.

I was talking only yesterday with a Presbyterian Elder here in Philadelphia. We were talking about the disaster of denying any part of the word of God, and I mentioned something that was new to him and startled him. He hadn't realized it, and perhaps some of us here do not realize it.

We think of the Church of England and the Church Missionary Society which has been going on for a hundred years, Church Missionary Society under the great Church of England. We think of them as rather conservative; we think the British are slower to act and more conservative than some of us rather hasty Americans. But do we realize that years ago the modernism, the critical positions in the Church of England Missionary Society, the Church Missionary Society of the great Church of England, had begun to be so critical, so radical, so far a departure from belief in the whole Bible as the word of God that the true Evangelical believers in the Church of England were alarmed, were concerned, were distressed, and finally had to take drastic action.

A dozen years ago, about twelve or fourteen years ago the Evangelicals in the Church of England tried

to get the Church Missionary Society to declare itself in an unequivocal way for the whole faith, and for the Bible as the word of God, the authority of Jesus Christ, and the fundamentals of the faith. A committee was appointed to draw up a statement, and the Evangelicals worked with that committee to get them to include just two points, among other things, those two points in the report that the committee was to make to the Church of England Missionary Society; the trustworthiness of the historical records of the Bible was one thing, and the second was the truth of all Christ's utterances.

A resolution to that effect was prepared by a minister, a Mr. Bartram, and a committee considered those two points. They ruled out the first; they said they never could get by the Church Missionary Society a record requiring belief in the trustworthiness of the historical parts of the Bible. Some members of the committee said, "Yes, we could, but not the truth of all of Christ's utterances."

Then there was a violent protest against even that within the Church Missionary Society on the part of missionary secretaries and missionaries. I am holding in my hands a leaflet from the Church Missionary Society. The Church Missionary Society finally drew up

its statement omitting both of those points, omitting any declaration of belief in the historical records of the Bible and in the truth of the utterances of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Bishop Ingram said it was hopeless to get such a declaration passed, and they had to agree to leave out everything that hurts anyone. A statement that Christ always spoke the truth would have hurt the modernists in the conservative old C. M. S., the Church and Missionary Society of the Church of England, /so they rejected a resolution to declare themselves as believing the truthfulness of our Lord's utterances, and in the reliability of the historical parts of the Bible.

What happened then? A new foreign Missionary Society was formed within the Church of England. This leaflet I have in my hands came out in February of 1923, a dozen years ago. Why a new society? They gave out these facts that I have just given, and I think we see the reason why a new Missionary Society had to be formed on the part of true believers within the Church of England whose souls were outraged and agonized as they realized their own beloved Church of England Missionary Society no longer would believe in the utterances of our Lord Jesus Christ as true.

Here is another leaflet published by the

P. C. M. S., Presbyterian Church Missionary Society, called, "The reason for the parting of the ways." I have just given you the reasons existing in the Church of England a dozen years ago, the reason for the parting of the ways, and we see it, dear friends, in such facts as I have already mentioned, and I shall mention the reason for the parting of the ways here in our own Presbyterian church.

Another, or, rather, the same Christian Sunday school teacher I mentioned a while ago talked with her pastor asking him whether he believed in the bodily resurrection of Christ. He said, "Yes, I believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ because I think it is the simplest way out, but if anyone comes to me and says, 'It was a vision,' I have no quarrel with him. All I want to know is Christ made Himself known to His disciples; I do not care whether he had body or vision. I don't expect to have a body, myself."

This lady writes in a personal letter, "The Jonah story was merely an allegory, and it was the same as if the pastor was quoting from Hamlet, a Shakespearean drama. He said, 'The story of the Garden of Eden was allegorical, and it makes no difference whether you believe in the Virgin birth or not.'"

This minister has until recently belonged to the foreign Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

I have other articles in my hand that I shall not take the time to quote from denying many of the fundamentals of our faith.

I know a young minister in Los Angeles, California, who has been doing a splendid work among the students of the University of California at Los Angeles. He believes in the whole Bible; he believes in the Lord's return; he believes in all the fundamentals of the faith, and he started what is called the Bible Clubs, the University Bible Clubs, and hundreds and hundreds of students are being led out into an utterly new stand for the Bible and appreciation of the word of God.

Because he dared to do that independently without being authorized by the Presbytery of Los Angeles, he has now been excommunicated as a Presbyterian minister, and he has lost his standing and position in the Presbytery of Los Angeles.

I have in my hands a snapshot, a photograph of a large placard, a circular, and in the University of California in Los Angeles leading the university religious conference -- this was the University Religious

Conference in which this young Presbyterian minister could not conscientiously join -- it gives names of those who joined, Baptists, Congregationalists, Catholics, Mohammedans, Buddhists, Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Unitarians, and Y. M. C. A. That is the Universal Religious Conference. Dr. W. P. Weikel sent me that photograph and wrote across the top of that placard, "To the Unknown God."

We don't want, my dear friends, Presbyterian ministers, some of whom are standing true in our Presbyterian societies with a group of that sort and have it laid on their souls and hearts to do other independent work.

I haven't time to bring other evidences of the fact of denial of faith of the word of God by Presbyterian ministers. I have been limiting entirely what I am saying to those I know to be Presbyterian ministers and believers.

I have an article from the "Continent," no longer published, by Dr. Mc Afee, in which Dr. Mc Afee fifteen years ago went on record in this long article as saying it was vitally important that churches everywhere should face anew the duty of revising, rewriting and re-

placing the Westminster confession of faith. "It is time that document was done away with and replaced," says Dr. Mc Afee, one of the secretaries of our board of foreign missions. And when you and I know it is based wholly on the word of God and is one of the most glorious confessions in the Christian Church!

When I got back from California after three months' Bible conference work I found a letter from a northern Presbyterian missionary in India. He read an account of the last meeting held in this church last February, and it cheered his heart. He has opened his heart in a personal letter which I can't read, but he told me of case after case of missionaries in India who are standing for modernism of varied degrees, questioning points, or denying the importance of the Virgin birth, and other fundamentals of the faith. You can imagine how modernist that missionary field is when, as he says, there are at least fifteen modernist missionaries in our mission, Presbyterian missionaries he was referring to.

So, dear friends, we see the need of testimony to the faith, such a testimony as this meeting to-night has been called to bear. The denial of the word of God, its authority, the truth and supremacy of the

word of God, is causing the disaster, causing the crisis, and is a demand for true testimony in the church. As the Church of England -- I mean the Bible League of England has issued a call for true testimony to the Bible, and the Bible Society has taken its stand and, thank God, right here, Westminster Seminary is taking its stand and meeting the demand for true testimony, our Presbyterian board of foreign missions is doing here in our denomination exactly what the Bible Missionary Society has done in England.

I had just a taste of what has been happening in a more serious degree to some of my friends in the Presbyterian church; this past summer in San Francisco I was invited by two large Bible classes, the women's Bible class and the men's Bible class of the Calvary Presbyterian Church, the leading church of San Francisco, to speak to the two classes combined one Sunday morning. I accepted the invitation although I had to speak twice that day, morning and evening, in other churches.

On Thursday of the week, two or three days before the Sunday I was to speak, I received a letter from the session of Calvary Church. I will just read it to you.

"The session by unanimous action has directed me to advise you that it withdrew the invitation to address the adult Bible classes in Calvary Presbyterian Church heretofore extended to you. The action of the session was based on the content of an address delivered by you at a mass meeting February 28th, 1935."

That was an address I had the pleasure of giving, although most reluctantly, calling attention to some of the shocking facts of unbelief and modernism in our foreign missions board, and in the foreign field, and because of that testimony that was given right here in this church at a meeting which many of you attended, a Presbyterian church closed its door to anyone who would declare his belief in the whole Bible as the word of God and expressing regret for the denial of the word of God on the part of a missionary.

So, dear friends, may God lead us and guide us as we go on in our testimony, the testimony as Presbyterians, the testimony which some of us enjoyed as ruling elders in the Presbyterian church, and the testimony of the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenants Union, and the new paper, the "Presbyterian Guardian," all of which are bringing glorious expressions of the believe, I believe, of hundreds of thousands of God's

people in our denomination, that our Scripture is given by inspiration of God. Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, we ask thee that Thou wilt go far beyond that which any human words can express either in this meeting tonight or as we go from here to our places of service and testimony in work. Wilt Thou lift up the standard of the Holy Spirit against the oncoming forces of unbelief and vindicate the name of Thy dear Son, and the living, powerful word which Thou hast given in these Scriptures, we ask in His dear name, Amen.

DR. MACHEN: Tonight I want to present to you a text from the word of God as being, it seems to me, the text that has been laid on the hearts of those who are entering into the Presbyterian Constitutional Couvenant Union, that is found in the epistle to James, first chapter, and part of the twenty-second verse: "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only."

We have been listening to orthodox sermons; we have been reading the word of God; we have been talking orthodoxy; we have been professing orthodoxy; we have been speaking to others of orthodoxy. The time has now come when we must show by our deeds whether we

really in our heart of hearts love this word and are determined to be doers of it and not hearers only.

The reason for that assertion that this text is the text for us today has been given in the words of Dr. Trumbull, and much other evidence could be presented.

I propose just a few minutes, with your permission to review in a few words very briefly, because I am speaking on what is familiar to most of you, the happenings one after another which have led to the crisis in which we stand tonight.

In 1920 in this city the plan of organic union was proposed in the General Assembly meeting in the Academy of Music, a plan of organic union which would have united about twenty-three different denominations with a vague preamble in lax testimony to modern unbelief. That was presented by Dr. Stevens of Princeton speaking for one in ill health who should have presented it.

It was sent down to the Presbytery without a word of debate. The steam roller General Assembly was in full operation. Dr. Kennedy pled for five minutes that he might speak on that great attack on the Christian faith. Not one word of debate was allowed, although one of the leading modernists spoke on it.

The defenders of the faith continued in their work. In 1923 because of the infidel preaching going on in the first Presbyterian church of New York, Dr. Mc Cartney came forth with an overture from the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the General Assembly. That was given to the bills and overtures committee, and twenty-three out of twenty-four brought in a very pious resolution in vague language, and one Dr. Mc ^{Linn} Glenahan came forth and presented a resolution which contained the famous Five Points of the General Assembly of 1923.

To the amazement of everyone, that passed by a close vote. Then there was a battle between what the General Assembly believed in 1923 with certain things that are at the heart of the Christian faith presented as being essential. The battle was on between them and unbelief, which was represented later by the Auburn affirmation.

In 1924 there was the great issue between the Bible believing forces of the church represented by Dr. Mc Cartney and the modernist forces. Dr. Mc Cartney went to the General Assembly to prosecute the battle against unbelief that was being taught at the First Presbyterian Church of New York. He was elected by a small majority. This was a victory for the Christian

forces in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

But the victory wasn't used; the Christian forces were utterly unprepared to make use of their victory, and absolutely nothing was done in the General Assembly of 1923 to reform the machinery of the church. One outrageous modernist lost an election to the Board of Foreign Missions, and one believer in the Bible was put in his place, but the machinery of the church remained in the hands of the same group, and remains there as firmly as before.

In 1925, Dr. Erdman was elected. In that year the permanent judicial commission declared the Virgin birth essential to our faith, and the Presbytery of New York erred in receiving a man who would not affirm his belief in the Virgin birth. That decree was not enforced, and that man is now an honored member of the Church of New York.

The Modernists in the Presbytery of New York are said to have had a defeat in the Assembly, but Dr. Erdman appointed a commission of fifteen which, in two hours' time, gave the modernists all they desired, simply stating that there was no particular quarrel in the church, although there were many attacking the Christian faith. In other words, the modernists re-

ceived all they liked, and those who had been rejected by the decision of the 1925 continued their complete control of the church. That was the last time when the Permanent Judicial Commission had a conservative majority. From that time the permanent Judicial Commission has been completely in the control of the modernists, as it is at the present time. That was the despairing case of the conservative majority in the highest Judicial Commission of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Then the battle went on. The modernists were in control of the machinery of the church by a mopping-up process. The old Princeton Theological Seminary was like a trench that had been captured. It needed to be cleaned up, so the modernists cleaned it up by reorganization in 1929, a victory for the modernists. Princeton Theological Seminary has been made to conform with the general drift of the church, and has ceased to make trouble.

The Westminster Theological Seminary was formed, and people said it wouldn't last a year. It did last, but it was generally said the modernist-fundamentalist controversy was all happily over.

That was the customary thing for every news-

paper article to say, and everybody who alluded to the modernist-fundamentalist controversy alluded to it as though it was something that happened in the fourth century. That simply meant that the modernists were in complete control of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., but the conflict was not quite over.

In 1933 the issue was raised with regard to the Modernists Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

The point is often raised why was just the Board of Foreign Missions attacked? Now, my friends, I have listened to a great many foolish arguments in the last few years, but I am inclined to think the most foolish argument was we should not attack the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. because other boards are just as bad. Although evidence was presented against that board, it was said we ought to do nothing about it because the other boards had not been attacked.

It would be like a man who it was perfectly clear had committed murder, but it was said, "You ought not to convict him because, although he is an awful murderer, somebody else has murdered a few more people than he has." Of all the silly arguments I have heard, it

seems to me that is about the silliest.

Why was it the issue between modernism and Christian belief arose in the Board of Foreign Missions? It was because of certain things that had gone on, particularly the Book, "Rethinking Missions".

That happened to deal with foreign missions and not home missions; therefore, it raised the issue between Christian missions and something that is the direct opposite of Christian missions. That issue was raised by the appearance of that book. Our Board of Foreign Missions had expressed the hope that book would be a splendid help to Christian people. Then it happened this Board of Foreign Missions was careful to say absolutely nothing against it. It issued a statement not saying one word against it, and saying a number of things good about it, reserving judgment about its theological position. It came out with not one word of guidance to the people of God who had been told to look upon that attack on the Christian religion with hopefulness. It came later in a grudging sort of way hidden in the minutes of the General Assembly to the effect the Board of Foreign Missions was not in agreement with the stand taken on the basis of missions in that book.

That book is an attack upon Christian belief

from the first page to the last page, not only a certain chapter of it, but the whole book is an attack upon the very heart of the Christian religion, and any Board of Missions that was ringing out in defense of the Gospel would announce it as such. That is why the Board of Foreign Missions was attacked, because the great issue was raised by that book, which was one of the religious best sellers of the day, and had brought the issue between Christ and anti-Christ home to the conscience of the praying people in the church.

I was sitting in the Presbytery of New Brunswick in January of 1933 in a little town, and I didn't attempt to do anything particularly in that Presbytery. But I had in my pocket a certain statement I had prepared about foreign missions that I had been considering for another reason, and I did have in my position a certain amount of the formula of satisfaction with things as they were. There was the usual report about foreign missions and home missions, that the program should be endorsed, and all that, and it just came to me I wonder how you would feel about it.

For a good many years I have been talking about modernism and the difference between modernism and Christianity, and I have encouraged the people to

contend for the faith, and I was sitting in my own Presbytery in the position of endorsing this abominable modernistic program. I don't know how you would have felt about it, but I felt that my orthodoxy was nothing but a sham if I did not rise in that Presbytery and oppose that endorsement of the foreign mission program.

An overture was presented which was very simple in its nature, namely, that there should be reform in the personnel of the Board of Foreign Missions, that there should be placed upon that board people who know the difference between Christianity and modernism, and who are determined to stand on the Christian side. The overture was rejected by that Presbytery, but it was sent up to the General Assembly by this Presbytery, and in the General Assembly of 1933 it was rejected, and the Board of Foreign Missions was and is whitewashed, and all went on exactly as before.

Now, at that timethere was an announcement of the formation of the independent board for Presbyterian foreign missions, and it seems to me, my friends, again if a man simply stood by and did nothing about it at that time, then he would be simply a hearer of the word and not a doer.

This thing has been forced upon us. Men

have come to me, students who want to go to the mission field, and have asked me what I thought they should do about it, whether they should go to the Foreign Missions Office on Fifth Avenue. For years I told them to go and try and see if they could get accepted, in spite of the fact they were standing for the Gospel, which that board was not, and that board had signers of the Auburn Affirmation sitting there to interview them. Some of them they did send; some of the best they did ^{not} send, but, anyhow, they presented themselves. There were various reasons given; I knew they didn't have much chance.

It came to me finally the time for that had gone past. I don't know whether you think I was right or not. But I have been teaching the Epistle of Galatians in class for years, chapter one, verses eight and nine:

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

It just came to me that I was nothing but a sham, as I had been teaching Bible to them in my classes,

and then when they were going out and wanted to preach that gospel, and wanted to attack any other gospel as false as they must, and came to me and asked me what to do about it, whether I had any advice to help them and I didn't have anything to say to them. Do you think a man has any joy in teaching the Bible when he is not interested in the thing? Maybe there are some professors in theological seminaries who say, "I just teach very orthodox doctrine in my class room, but I don't care a bit what you do when you go out from here, or whether there is any opportunity for you to preach the gospel you have learned."

I think the teaching of the Bible would be the most miserable task in the world with that attitude in regard to it. I can't understand that at all, how a church can just teach Bible as purely an academic exercise and not be interested in the application of the Bible when people go out from the class rooms. That is a miserable business. If we really believe in the teaching we got to act on it.

So, the independent board for Presbyterian foreign missions was formed and, of course, they said it would not last. But it has lasted; it has sent out missionaries and God is blessing its work.

Then that board was attacked; there was a concerted attack upon the whole attempt to reform the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A.

Let's pass into review the way that attack is coming up. At the present time the Reverend Carl Mc Intire, as you know, Pastor of a great church near here, has been suspended from the ministry because he loves ^{the} gospel and the Lord Jesus Christ enough to proclaim it, enough to proclaim it in the centers of unbelief that now dominate the church. Because he is zealous in the proclamation of the Lord Jesus Christ he is suspended from the ministry by his Presbytery.

Out in the West the Reverend John J. Deward, a splendid pastor of a splendid church, has just had his pastoral relations dissolved between him and his church at the request of twenty-five mal-contented in his congregation when three hundred and seventy-three members of his congregation sent to the Presbytery a formal signed petition endorsing Mr. Deward and expressing their affection for him and their desire to retain him as their pastor.

Why was his pastoral relations dissolved? Because Mr. Deward would not promise he would refrain from criticism of the boards of the church in his pulpit

or in private.

Just think of that! A man cannot even say the Board of Foreign Missions has erred and not put an dot on an i and a cross on a t, or he would have his pastoral relations dissolved; a man cannot express criticism of these human agencies.

Out in Wisconsin the Reverend Arthur F. Perkins has been suspended from the ministry for two years. Why? Because he has committed a terrible fault; he has organized a conference of young people to study the word of God under the guidance of people who believe in the word of God. A terrible thing; a terrible crime; so, he has been suspended from the ministry.

Here in this Presbytery you remember Mr. Murry Forst Thompson and Miss Mary Stewart have been brought to trial in the session of Hollond Memorial Church in secret, a secret trial. They have been deprived of that right to an open hearing which is given to the most degraded criminal under our civil law. The church stands on a lower plane than the world that makes no profession of religion at all.

It was stated by that commission that none of the persons present should divulge a word of what was said in that secret commission. We lost no time in tell-

ing that commission we intended to let the light of day shine on all our actions -- at least, that is what I told them, and the same thing was said by others; we could not be downed by that disgrace of secret trial.

The church doesn't claim to be perfect, but it does claim to be perfectly open for all the world to see, and when you close the doors of trials in the church and seek to keep the troubles in the church, the world outside is going to have a pretty clear notion something not open is not likely to be above board.

In this Presbytery a commission from the General Assembly has been holding its sessions in secret again, and it refused even to listen to a man who, when he came there, would not promise to keep secret what was said in that commission. That commission is so completely partial in its membership that it could not have been more partisan if it had been appointed by the modernists complainants in the Presbyteries of Chester and Philadelphia that are being investigated. I think I can say with some deliberateness so far as six members of that commission are concerned, it would have been impossible for the modernist complainants in that dispute to have appointed a commission which more completely represented their point of view if they

had had the appointment of the commission, themselves. That is the commission that is examining the affairs, examining in secret the affairs of these two Presbyteries.

It has just come to my attention tonight that yesterday the Presbytery of New Castle voted to bring Carl S. Laird to trial because of his membership on the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions. These are some of the ways in which the modernist control has made itself felt. It is exalting the word of man over the word of God.

But perhaps the most serious way in which this issue is being forced upon people in the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A. is found when men come before Presbyteries for licenture and ordination. I have seen that thing going on; young men come and they are asked this: will you support the boards and agencies of the church?

Any minister that says in answering that question, "Yes, I will support the boards and agencies of the church," has no right to be regarded for one moment as a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, because he has promised beforehand he will support whatever missionary program is set up by changing majorities in a human council, the General Assembly, and no man who has

that Bible open before him and is going to follow God's word in that matter can possibly make any such promise as that. No man who really believes in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. can ever possibly burden his conscience in that fashion. Yet that awful temptation is being put before young men again and again. "Will you support the boards and agencies of the church? Will you promise not to discuss these matters in public? Will you promise you will only take judicial action against anything that is wrong in the church, and will you if that is not successful promise that you will not engage in this sort of attack on the things of the church?"

That without quoting the language at all is the general spirit of examination after examination. Some men yield to the temptation; other man stand as true as gold. It is a serious thing to close the doors of the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to any man who will not deny his Lord as the Christ before becoming licensed or ordained in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Now, my friends, it is in view of that situation the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union is formed. It is because this issue has been forced upon

us, whether we are going to be true to the Lord Jesus Christ, or whether we are going to be untrue. That issue has been forced upon us; we have not sought it; we cannot evade it and still take the word of God seriously.

My friends, we have faced this question in many ways. What shall we do? Shall we continue in this modernist church, this church dominated in its machinery by modernism, or shall we after an earnest effort to reform this church withdraw from this organization and be in a church that is true to the word of God?

There are considerations of policy on one side and on the other side. If we withdraw it is said we will leave our property to the modernists. A man might say, "Why, I helped to put up church buildings that are in the possession of modernists and will be used in the future to attack the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ," as so many undoubtedly are used. Are you on the one side or on the other?

People don't seem to examine the word of God on this point, and when you do examine the Bible, when you examine the Bible fairly and openly, when you have it before you and ask God to open it to you, I tell you, my friends, I do not believe the Bible permits Christian people year after year and decade after decade to be in

a church that is so completely corrupt in its total organization as in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

I know perfectly well that the Bible does not assume that the church militant, the church on this earth is perfect, and no Christian has a right to withdraw from any branch of the visible church on earth just because that branch of the visible church is not perfect. That is perfectly true.

But, all the same, where the whole central machinery of the church is so hostile to any clear cut gospel and is so completely dominated by unbelief as the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has been dominated by unbelief for a decade or two, I don't believe the Bible contemplates Christian people being in such an organization as though it were a real Christian church.

There are two things to do: one thing is there should come a reform in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and some people think it is possible. I think that it is possible, too, because with God all things are possible. But I don't think there is any human possibility of it. I think that if it comes it will come by the wonderful majesty of the spirit of God, and pray God that it may come, that there may be a complete change of heart. And in the last eight months it

may be shown there is a real deep seated change in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. But don't be satisfied with any superficial tinkering with this problem, as though by putting in a little window dressing of one conservative here and there on the boards of the church is going to do the slightest bit of good. It is needed there should be definite steps taken to eradicate unbelief at the heart of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., or else it is necessary, as our covenant says in the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union, that those who really love the word of God should take steps no matter what it costs. It is better to let goods and kindred go than to continue to live in the Presbyterian Church in this country.

I am wondering, my friends, whether there is not before your eyes tonight, in this great meeting tonight, a wonderful vision of hope. I have a wonderful vision before my eyes tonight. It is the vision of being a member of a real church devoted to the word of God, not a church in which unbelief dominates; not a church in which at every presbytery meeting and every General Assembly there is a battle between those who believe in the word of God and the forces that are hostile to the Christian religion, and the hostile forces

are generally victorious, but a church composed of brethren, a church composed of those who really do believe that this Book is true, that there is no salvation except by the message that this book presents, that there is no savior except the savior who was born of a Virgin and who worked miracles, and who rose in the same body in which he suffered, and suffered to satisfy divine justice, and to reconcile us to God; that it is a great joy to be in Presbyteries and in General Assemblies consisting of people who believe that in their heart of hearts, and who unite in prayer on the basis of this blessed program.

I tell you, my friends, there is before my mind a vision of such a church. How that church will come we do not exactly know. May pitfalls be avoided; The pitfall of forming some new church. God save us from forming a new church. Let the church that is formed be no new church, but the real, honest continuation of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in that it is true to the constitution of that church founded on the word of God and continues these things that have been lost by the machinery, to which the machinery of that church at present is untrue.

Let it not be a new church. Let it be a

church that preserves the great heritage of faith in God's holy word.

There is before our eyes, I think, the vision of such a church, and if there was such a church, my friends, think of what might be done by the blessing of God.

Have you ever had the burden on your heart of these great foundations that are now caving, where in many of the cities the word of God is not proclaimed at all in any clear cut fashion? Have you had before your minds the burden of those cities?

I remember one such city where the General Assembly was only a few years ago. So far as I know, not a single minister in the Presbyterian Church in that city is standing against modernism and in favor of the Book. There may be such an one, but I have heard nothing of him. There are individual people in that city who love their Bible and are sick at heart because our churches are being poisoned by the vague preaching or worse that they are receiving in church Sunday after Sunday. They want to be in a real church; they want to have their children nurtured in the word of God. There is no place they can go.

How glorious it would be to send real mis-

sionaries to such pagan cities as that. It seems to me the time for real Evangelism has come -- not Evangelism that is a sham; Evangelism like the Evangelism of these committees when you have on the very committee prating about Evangelism men who deny the heart of the faith as the Auburn Affirmationists do; not a sham of Evangelism which dodges the question which gospel is true, but a real Evangelism which stands for this word.

The time has come for such Evangelism. There is a weight hanging upon us through our connection with unbelief. We are struggling against that weight; we are trying to continue the ~~work~~ of the Lord in spite of our connection with the unbelieving machinery of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

But just by the rage of the enemy, by the very rage of the enemy it does look as though the blessed result might be brought about, that there might be in some way or other, whether by way of reform or by way of separation, God knows which, that there should be a real church standing for the whole truth of the word of God, taking up in earnest, with earnest prayer the burden of seeking to conserve the Christian people who are left in the midst of the paganism of these cities of ours, and should go on in earnest trusting in God, not in

human numbers, but in God to bring the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ to the lost in these cities.

A little while ago in this church, just a few nights ago, I was present at the farewell which the people of this church gave to Messrs. Long and Hitchcock, who are going to an utterly pioneer field in South America. They are going out there far from everything that makes the world pleasant for most of us.

I thought as I saw them going out, they are going out as missionaries under the Independent Board. It came to me there was the world on one side and Christ on the other, and those men had made their decision that they were going to stand for Christ against the world. It is a glorious thing.

I believe there is a field for pioneer mission work right in this country today. It is in these cities where people are being lost where we are standing aside and where we are allowing the gospel that is no gospel; it is not saving a single soul.

And we are doing nothing about it. We are doing nothing about it when we have the opportunity to bring the gospel to those lost people that they might be saved.

Now, my friends, it would be difficult to

know how that could be brought about except the enemies of the faith brought it about by their own attack on the gospel. Again and again in the Bible we have been told that the rage of the enemies of the faith is used by God for his great purpose, and so it may be that this very great attack upon the gospel which is going on to-day is being used in the gracious province of God that a new stand may be taken, something gloriously new; the confirmation of the Gospel by a real Presbyterian Church in many places where there is no proclamation of the gospel at all. Thank God the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenants Union has been formed by those who believe that this great issue has been forced on us.

What harm is being done by mere orthodox sermons on the part of people who will not stand for the faith when the General Assembly meets! You can listen to some people who fulminate against modernism, and you would think in their sermons on Sunday morning they were opposed to this unbelief with all their souls. If it is one thing unbelievers love, it is orthodox sermons on the part of those who stand with unbelief, because, don't you see, those men are Exhibit A for the modernists in their attack upon the gospel. They say so and so is such a wonderful orthodox preacher and yet he does no-

thing against the Auburn Affirmation and thinks it is all perfectly all right. Infinite harm is being done, as the Bible says it can be done, by those who are merely hearers of the word and not doers also, whose orthodoxy is one in word only and not in deed, and I thank God that he has laid upon the hearts of some men a line of thought like this; something should be done because the time for mere protest is over, and that we should now proceed to band ourselves together in a covenant of people who are ready to make sacrifices for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ.

God grant that in these momentous months, eight months or six months that follow, there may be a great advance of this movement, and that it may be discovered that there is a considerable company of the people in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. who are ready to stand for the Lord Jesus Christ no matter what it costs. And may God send the day when the gospel may go forth from a true church with the prayers of those that are there for the saving of lost souls. Let us unite in a word of prayer.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Oh Lord, we rejoice that it is quite independent of favor of men, that it is

a gift of Thy Grace. We rejoice that it has been the means of saving countless souls, and that it is saving souls today, and we pray that it may have free course.

Bless those with whom we differ in this conflict. Do Thou touch the hearts of those who are opposing the gospel of Christ that we might have the great joy of being in true Christian fellowship with them. Do Thou change their hearts, but do Thou protect those who are being led astray by their error, and Do Thou teach Thy little ones the error of such ways, and protect them, and send the gospel in its purity to the end of the earth, and to the people of this country, for the saving of souls.

And all that we ask is in the blessed name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, Amen.



Please return to R. J. J. J.

July 26, 1954

The Rev. James H. Snowden, D. D.
The Rev. James E. Clarke, D. D.

Dear Friends:

The Moderator and the Stated Clerk called a meeting in Philadelphia on Tuesday of this week of the Administrative Committee of the General Council to consider whether anything should be done and, if so, what, with regard to the document which Dr. Macartney has circulated through the Church for signatures, attacking the authority and action of the General Council and rejecting the action of the last General Assembly with regard to the Independent Board. They invited me to attend this meeting, but I at first declined, believing that the Board of Foreign Missions ought not to be involved in this matter, as the question is distinctly a constitutional question for the determination of the courts of the Church. They insisted, however, on my coming, not as one connected with the Board of Foreign Missions but solely as a former member of the Administrative Committee and a former Moderator of the Assembly. I shared, accordingly, in the discussion, and at the end was asked to write to you, giving a few reflections on the issue that has been raised by Dr. Macartney's paper and his article in *The Presbyterian*. I am very glad to do this, with the distinct understanding that these are merely personal and confidential reflections for you to turn over in your own mind in connection with any discussion of the matter which you may deem wise in the *Banner and Advance*.

1. One would think that this was a very good opportunity for some playful and good-natured satire regarding Dr. Macartney's document, which might be characterized as "Autumn Affirmation No. 2" or "the Pittsburgh Negation" or "Dr. Macartney's Manifesto." It might be pointed out also the position in which all signers of the document will now place themselves, in view of Dr. Macartney's article in *The Presbyterian* of July 19, in which he issues as his own declaration the entire substance of the document which he has asked others to sign. All the signatories of this document will not be simply in the position of echoes and endorsers of Dr. Macartney.

2. The document at the very outset in the 5th paragraph puts all its signatories in the position not only of taking Dr. Macartney's view as to the alleged abridgment of liberty but also of declaring themselves as regarding as an open question the judgment of the Assembly with regard to the unwisdom of the organization of the Independent Board. One fears that some may be deceived by the subtle implication of this paragraph, which practically disputes the authority of the General Assembly in a matter which certainly is indisputable, namely, the question of "the wisdom or unwisdom of the organization of the Independent Board."

3. The declaration does not fairly cite the functions and duties of the General Council as embodied in the Form of Government, and it overlooks the fact that the General Assembly, which is the one authority in the matter, accepted and endorsed the action of the General Council and its course of procedure.

4. The declaration in its assertion that the General Assembly action abridges liberty of giving overlooks and misrepresents the explicit language of the Assembly's deliverance which in three paragraphs, namely, the 6th, 7th and 8th, unequivocally declares: "the rights of individual members to give their money or efforts to such missionary objects as they may choose."

July 26, 1934

5. The reference to the Concurrent Declarations of 1869 is wholly misleading. The question then was as to the arrangements that should be made with regard to the Old and New School Churches, a reunion of which there is ground to fear Dr. Macartney and Dr. Machen would have opposed and even now disapproved. The New School Churches had been making their contributions through the home and foreign Mission agencies of the Congregational Church. The question was as to whether they must at once discontinue these contributions or might for the time being continue them. There were New School ministers who had been sent out under the American Board to the foreign field and whom the New School Churches were maintaining. It was agreed that the rupture should not be sudden, but it was also clearly understood that the home and foreign mission work of the reunited Church would be a united work and that just as soon as possible all churches would make their contributions to the agencies of the General Assembly. We had a somewhat similar situation in the proposed union of the United Presbyterians, and one of the Concurrent Declarations in this plan provided for the temporary continuance of the Woman's Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church. In neither case was the situation analogous to the present one, of the establishment of a new agency inside the Church, attacking the agencies of the Church and denying the authority of the Church.

6. At this point reference should be made to the contention that the Independent Board is not in the Presbyterian Church. The answer is that it is not in the Presbyterian Church in the sense allowed by our Constitution and that it is in the Presbyterian Church in the sense forbidden by our Constitution. The Charter of the Independent Board relates it distinctly to the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; it binds it to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; its missionaries are to be missionaries holding the doctrine and the Church Government of the Presbyterian Church; its purpose is to encourage Presbyterian churches and individuals to support this Board; its actual field of operation has been in the churches of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; the only missionaries it has thus far appointed have been ministers of our Church; its chief basis of appeal has been that the Independent Board was necessary for churches and individuals in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. because the Assembly's Board was "unfaithful to the Word of God and propagating Modernism." In all these regards both by its Charter and by its activity the Independent Board is in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. On the other hand, it is in this Church in distinct contravention of Chapter 25 of the Form of Government. It is hard to conceive how language could be more explicit in its prohibition of exactly such an organization as the Independent Board and the activities which it is carrying on. Please reread this chapter.

7. It is interesting to see how both in the methods pursued and in the principles advocated the Fundamentalist group is standing now on the ground which it rejected in the matter of Union Theological Seminary and the Auburn Affirmation. You would do well, to look back over the files of The Presbyterian of a decade ago to see how ~~feebly~~ ^{firmly} then the authority of the General Assembly was asserted and a little further back to see how earnestly those who later supported Westminster Seminary were in denouncing procedures in connection with Union which rested on the same principles. I believe also that at a conference with the Commission of Fifteen, Dr. Macartney himself defended the supremacy and finality of authority of the General Assembly in regard to issues no clearer, at least than the present ones on which he is taking a diametrically opposite position. I think that you could get this statement of Dr. Macartney's and some of the declarations of The Presbyterian from Dr. Mudge or Dr. Pugh. It is well to keep in mind that the authority of the General Assembly in the matter of doctrinal deliverances has limits which were described in the report of the Commission of Fifteen and accepted by two General Assemblies but that in an administrative question, such as that of the organization and control of Boards, there seems to be no constitutional limit to the Assembly's power.

July 26, 1934

8. Perhaps a word should be said with regard to Dr. Macartney's argument in his declaration, section 5, that the General Assembly's action has resulted in the addition by the Presbyteries and the Assembly of an ~~extra-constitutional question~~ "to the subscription vows of another vow not required by the Constitution." This is neither ingenious nor true. Neither the Assembly nor the Presbyteries have any power to add to the constitutional questions. But the Form of Government, Chapter 14 and Chapter 15, prescribes that the constitutional questions are to be asked only after the Presbytery has satisfied itself by thorough examination on many points specified in these chapters. ~~It is~~ It is competent and obligatory for the Presbytery to ask all the questions that are required in order to demonstrate the fitness of the candidate for the Presbyterian ministry. It is perfectly right for the Presbytery to ask the candidate for his views regarding Miracles, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection and matters regarding Church administration. In asking these questions the Presbytery is making no additions to the constitutional vows. To allege, as Dr. Macartney appears to allege, that the only questions the Presbytery has any right to ask are the constitutional vows is wholly unwarranted, as Dr. Macartney well knows. He himself has been among those who had insisted that many other questions should be asked of candidates for licensure. It is interesting in this connection to note in Dr. Macartney's article in The Presbyterian that he quotes six of the eight constitutional questions at ordination but does not quote the fourth and ignores altogether questions 3 and 4 of the questions at licensure, where the candidate promises to "study the peace, unity and purity of the Church" and to submit himself to the government of his Presbytery. As I understand the action of a number of Presbyteries as I have heard it reported by their members, it has not been the attitude of candidates toward the Board of Foreign Missions that has been the most critical issue, but the attitude of these candidates toward the unity and peace of the Church and the authority of the courts of the Church. The Presbyteries have been concerned because the candidates have been imbued with the spirit of what Dr. Machen describes as "the fight." [See report of Dr. Machen's speech in the Christian Reformed Banner of July 20] Some of the Presbyteries say that wholly apart from any issue of Boards, whether the Assembly's Boards or the Independent Board, the peace and unity of the Presbytery have been disturbed by men who had brought into it this spirit of controversy and division.

9. If Dr. Macartney's deliverance is designed to influence, as it clearly is, the coming General Assembly, does it not fall under the condemnation of this method of action embodied in the resolution of the General Assembly of '28 (See Minutes, page 79, disapproving the method of seeking to influence the Assembly by documents circulated through the Church for signature) Dr. Macartney's declaration in the last paragraph explicitly states that it is submitted to the General Assembly, a procedure which the General Assembly itself has declared to be improper. Please refer to this Minute of '28.

10. The fundamental question, of course, is as to what liberty is. Presbyterians do not believe that liberty is individual license. Liberty with us is liberty within the law and under the Constitution. Some of the arguments of Dr. Macartney and Dr. Machen mean sheer independency. They are a surrender of the Presbyterian Form of Government and are inconsistent with the tradition, the spirit and the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism. The men who hold these views will not be able to save themselves from Independency in Church Government.

Would it not be well to recall, in appealing to actions in connection with past unions, the articles of the Basis of Union of 1758 and Dr. Charles Hodge's comment thereon? I enclose a copy of these declarations and Dr. Hodge's

Drs. Snowden and Clarke - 4.

July 26, 1934

comment taken from his "History of the Presbyterian Church."

Let me say again that I am not writing as a Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions and that I think it is a great deal wiser for me, because I am a Secretary of the Board, not to participate in this discussion. I am writing only as a private member of the Church, called in consultation by the Moderator and in response to his request.

With warm regard -

Very cordially yours,

RES:AMW

Phila. address

Chambers - Geyte - Chubb

Apr. 30, 1935



ADDRESS BY DR. ROBERT E. SPEER

at
PRESBYTERIAN MASS MEETING

held in the

CHAMBERS WYLIE MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

at

BROAD STREET below SPRUCE STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

on

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1935, at 8:30 O'CLOCK P.M.

DR. SPEER: Mr. Chairman, and friends of the cause of foreign missions, we are not met here tonight for argument or controversy. I think it is true of most of us, I hope it is true of all of us, that we entertain toward one another here this evening no other feeling than a feeling of complete mutual trust, and that we are gathered here in absolute confidence in the foreign missionary work of our Church and with deep and unconditioned affection for the men and women, our own children, who have gone out in the name of the Church and in the name of Christ to the uttermost parts of the earth to make the only gospel of our Lord and Saviour known to all the world.

I like to think of our gathering here this evening as a meeting of stockholders in a great enterprise that belongs to us as members of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. It has been the glory of our Church for a hundred years now that it has held fast to the principle that the Church herself, to quote the language of the Assembly of 1847, the Church herself is a missionary society whose main purpose is to aid in the conversion of the world, and every member of the Church is a member for life of this society and bound to do everything in his power to forward this great object. We are all of us members of a Church which regards us bound together corporately by bonds that cannot be broken to carry on the main business of the Church, to make Jesus Christ known to all the world. And I am

here this evening simply as one of the employed agents of your undertaking to make a report to you and to discuss here in the frankest and most open way the great issues with which we are having to deal today. I hope that all that I shall say this evening shall be said in love and Christian charity, and with no antagonism toward anyone in or out of our dear Church.

It will not be possible, of course, to evade the living issues that confront us in the Church, and in the world at home and abroad in this hour. But I think it will set us more at ease in considering them and give us all a more accurate and faithful Christian judgment with regard to them if we see them in their true proportion and perspective.

This is not the first time in the history of the missionary enterprise that difficulties exactly such as we are facing today have had to be met. For more than a hundred years there has been a monthly meeting of the secretaries of all the missionary societies in the city of London. A few years ago Dr. Ritson, the secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, wrote a charming account of the century and more of these gatherings, picking out from time to time what the great issues confronting the missionary enterprise from decade to decade had been. There came a great shock in the year 1825, when Edward Irving, then in the very height of his glory, before the deplorable developments came that took him out of the formal service of the Christian Church, had denounced the methods of the missionary enterprise in a sermon that he preached at the annual gathering of the London Missionary Society, and Dr. Ritson preserves the record of the meeting of this little group immediately after that sermon of Edward Irving's when they discussed this question: "What line of conduct should be adopted by missionary societies in order to obviate the dangers which may be apprehended from the agitation among their friends or agents or those controversies which have recently been moved in the Christian Church?" And a year later they came back to the same issue, discussing "in what light are we to regard the opposition now so generally excited against the diffusion of divine truth, and in what mode should it be met", and

then "what practical lessons may be learned from the recent admidversion on benevolent institutions." Again a little later they discussed, "what are the causes of that distrust which has been excited respecting the management of religious and missionary societies, and what is the best method of its removal?"

And these issues have not been alien to our own Church and our own land. We have a record in the old minutes of our Board of Foreign Missions back in Walter Lowrie's day of a communication that had been received from my old Presbytery of Huntingdon, in central Pennsylvania, to the effect that that Presbytery had resolved to postpone the forwarding of its offerings to the Board of Foreign Missions until it was assured that the notes of Albert Barnes were not being circulated in the missions of our Church in India.

I think it would be a grand thing if every minister of our Church and a large part of our laity today could bathe ourselves in the old history and tradition and temper of our Church. I read recently the whole of Charles Hodge's great volume on "Church Polity", his two volumes on the constitutional history of the Presbyterian Church, and only this last week, Robert E. Thompson's book on the "History of the Presbyterian Churches". If everyone of us would read those three books and Dr. Patton's "Fundamental Christianity", recover the urbanity, the large Christian-mindedness of these men, and then approach our problems today, remembering the issues through which our fathers have passed in the years that are gone, we could meet our problems with a Christian temper, and a spirit of brotherhood that would promise the passing of all contention and the recovery of absolute unity in the truth and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, let us approach the fundamental thing first of all, namely as to what the basis is on which the foreign missionary enterprise of our Church has been built, and to ask ourselves whether it is resting in absolute fidelity on that basis today. I don't think there is anyone in our Church who has read more assiduously

or more lovingly than I have done the early missionary records of our denomination. Elisha Swift and Walter Lowrie, as you know, were the two great figures that stand there on the threshold of the foreign missionary work of our Church. I have read all that either one of them has said or written on which I could lay my hands, and I think I know what the basis was that they laid down and I think we stand on that rock today immovably as they stood on it a hundred years ago when our foreign missionary work began.

Not long after the work was started Walter Lowrie, and his son John, who was our first missionary to India, and then came home to be associated with his father and to serve for half a century as a missionary secretary of our Board, laid down what they conceived to be the basis of the missionary enterprise of our church in the first manual of our Board. They said it rested on eight great foundations: first, it was based on the eternal love and purpose of God; second, on the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ; third, on the example of the early Church; fourth, on the essential nature of the Christian gospel; fifth, on the condition of men without that gospel; sixth, on the signs of Providence in the world; seventh, on the seal of the Holy Spirit; and eight, on the certainty of final success. Those were the eight grounds on which they said they were basing the enterprise at the beginning, and I think we stand solidly on those same eight grounds with all the truth of the New Testament today.

We had a few years ago, as some of you will remember, after the Great War which shook everything the world around, the first gathering of its kind ever held in our Church, at Princeton. It was a meeting of the Board and all its members and officers and representatives of the home Church and the wisest men and women who could be gathered from their work on the foreign field in all the missions of our Church. It was the function of that gathering to confront the whole enterprise of our Church in the foreign field, to lay down the lines on which that enterprise was to progress, and to define the basis on which it must rest. The three most important committees at

that conference had for their chairmen Dr. J. Walter Lowrie of China, gone now, of whom no words too high in praise and affection can be spoken, Dr. Watson M. Hayes, still at work in China, though long after seventy years of age and unsurpassed by any of the younger men, and Dr. Samuel A. Moffett of Korea, just retiring after his grand career. Now, you could not find in the world three wiser or more trustworthy missionaries than these, and they were the chairmen of the committees that defined the main issues with regard to our missionary undertaking. I have here, especially, the statement which our friend Dr. J. Walter Lowrie drafted, which ever since has been embodied in the manual of our Board as its fundamental aim and purpose and objective and has been copied by a number of the other denominations: "The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lored Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour, and to persuade them to become his disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen, and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ." We deem all methods and forms of missionary service legitimate in so far as they contribute to the realization of this aim. At the same time we recognize that questions of proportion and relation of various methods will have to be determined in the light of varying conditions. And then Dr. Lowrie proceeds to outline the great and legitimate methods that the missionary enterprise may use, of which I am going to say a word in just a moment.

Now, there it was laid down clearly in 1920. We stand solidly on that ground today and from that ground I do not believe the missionary enterprise of our Church will ever be removed. If you want a statement more clear and more recent even than that, it has been made. There is no Board that has borne the brunt of bitter criticism more than our Board and its officers have done in their repudiation of the doctrinal basis laid down in the first five chapters of the volume entitled "Re-Thinking Missions". If you ask any mission board throughout the world what board has stood like

a rock in the midst of all this discussion on which other boards have relied as standing immovably on the evangelical foundation, you would without exception get only one answer. It is the Board of which we are thinking here tonight. And I know personally, for I don't think anybody has borne more of that brunt, if I must say it, than I, on the one hand from those who regarded our criticism of that report as unjust, and on the other hand from those who thought that that criticism should have been stated in more violent terms, and in terms which it has seemed to us would have been in violation of the demands of the highest Christian considerateness and courtesy.

Let me read to you in just a few words the specific things that were said. Can you put it any more unequivocally or definitely than this: "This construction of Christianity and of its relation to non-Christian religions embodied in "Re-Thinking Missions" and this conception of Christ and His person, place and nature as a teacher and example and spirit with no avowed acceptance of Christ as God or as Redeemer or Saviour; and with no witness to the meaning of His death or the significance of His resurrection are not possible for our churches which hold the great creeds or even the Apostle's Creed, or which base themselves on the New Testament. The unique meaning of Christ as the Son of God and the divine Saviour, is to us the very essence of Christianity. That was what Christianity was. Its simple confession was of "Jesus, the Son of God, is Lord." It is so still. Christianity is not for us the life and teaching of Jesus only, or man's thought of God, or man's search for God. For us Christ is still the Way, not a way, and there is no goal beyond Him or apart from Him nor any search for truth that is to be found outside of Him, nor any final truth to be sought by universal religious quest except as it is sought in Him who is the Way, and the Truth, and the Life. Christianity is not what Jesus taught alone; it is what He did as Saviour by His life and death and resurrection, and all this is not obscurely figurative, as this volume says, an unexplained symbol. It cannot be left out because the words which alone can explain or communicate it have often been used. It is not to us a set of archaic ideas remote from real life. The only truly authentic Christianity

there ever was or ever will be is the Christianity that is both Jesus, the historic Son of Man and Son of God, and the eternal Christ, the risen and ever-living Master and Lord." If you can devise stronger words in which to define the absolute uniqueness and indispensableness of Jesus Christ, His Name as the only name given among men, Jesus Christ Himself as the sole light of the world, and the full revelation of the Father, we shall rejoice to use those words.

I would call your attention again to the Board's own affirmation of this unswerving evangelical conviction set forth in the little pamphlet which many of you have seen, entitled "A Statement of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church Regarding Current Criticisms of Its Work." I will not take time to read it, you can get it for yourself, any of you, and you will find there in the clearest and most unequivocal way the declaration of the great foundation doctrines on which our Church stands. I say it once again, the basis is what it has always been, it will be what it is now, and all of the Boards in the world I do not believe there is one that stands more firmly and immovably as a bulwark of that faith than the Board of which we are thinking tonight. I think I violate no confidence in reading just two sentences from a letter from a friend, one of the departmental editors of the Sunday School Times, who writes: "There is no doubt that the church in general is entering into a death struggle with neo-unitarianism. The Presbyterian Board appears to me to be the least affected of all mission boards." I would put it more strongly than that. I don't think it ought to be put merely in negative terms like these; positively, our Board is the surest and strongest defense we have in any missionary denominational board in the world, of the faith in which we grew up and by which we live.

I have spoken just as clearly as I could with regard to this fundamental basis. There must be a fundamental doctrinal basis. We have great convictions. Christianity is not only a set of facts, though it is that, but it is a great body of reasoned convictions with regard to those facts, and on those facts and on those convictions our missionary enterprise rests and will forever rest.

And in the second place, with regard to the scheme. There have been difficulties in many people's minds with regard to what one might call the methodology of our missionary undertaking. They wonder whether all that is embodied in this conviction, that has been expressed in this aim, is adequately carried out in the real processes of the work of our missionary enterprise around the world. Well, now that methodology can be stated very simply. It consists, in reality of just three great ideas of principles. These have had an interesting reaffirmation within the last few months in the British organization that is just re-launching in America, entitled the World Dominion Movement, of whose American committee, Dr. Zwemer is the chairman, and our friend Dr. Steward Robinson, editor of The Presbyterian, is the Vice-Chairman. This World Dominion Movement is not a missionary board. It is not setting out to collect money with which to send out missionaries or to carry on missionary work. It is a fund created by a Christian layman in Great Britain who was deeply interested in the missionary work and who left his estate when he passed on for the advocacy of these three great conceptions: first, the fundamental ideal of the missionary enterprise as evangelistic; second, its duty from the very beginning to establish autonomous and living Christian churches; and third, its obligation to survey the whole world and to urge plans for the whole missionary enterprise under the principle of thorough-going cooperation and unity. Now, these that seem to some to be new principles, as enunciated by the World Dominion Movement, are old principles, on which the missionary enterprise of our Church has rested from the beginning. They were just what Dr. Lowrie and his committee outlined in the Princeton Conference in 1910, and I would like to say a word about each of them to reassure any here or elsewhere who may be in doubt as to whether the central and supreme aim of our enterprise is really controlling or is intended to control all its processes and operations.

First of all, the primary thing is evangelism. It was in the early Church. I never have been able to understand how men, especially men whose profession it is to teach, like the authors of "Re-Thinking Missions", should discredit the passing on

of truth orally. How else is truth to be communicated except by word and life combined? Our Lord sent the early Christians out to preach the Gospel, to talk about Him to tell what they knew; and you can find half a dozen words in the New Testament, and fascinating words they are, that describe in different ways that colloquial communication of the Gospel from man to man. No, evangelism is on all fours with the evangelism of the New Testament, that is not distinctly, from first to last, and supremely, the oral communication of truth from mind to mind and from heart to heart. And this has been the glory of our missionary enterprise from the beginning. I think of the great names of Forman and Newton, in India, and of McGillivray and Jonathan Wilson, in Siam, of Hunter Corbett and J. L. Nevius, in China, and I could name scores more of them, great evangelists of the Christian Gospel. And I look back over my own experiences on the mission field, and the most vivid of them, of the bright memories that come back, are the fidelity and perseverance and power with which this great missionary company of ours is speaking about our Lord Jesus Christ and His Gospel to all the world.

My first visit to Korea was in 1897, when I went out to see my college classmate, Dr. Mudge's and mine, Graham Lee, who burned himself out preaching Christ in Korea. We walked together on foot overland the whole length of Northern Korea, and it was just one perpetual evangelistic meeting to be with him and with that old Korean native preacher who was with us, who would sit up all night as we lay on our cots in the little village streets, trying to find a little coolness for sleep. Whenever I looked I would see Yi with white robed figures all around him, talking of Christ. This was his first and last opportunity for that group, and he used it for his message about our Lord Jesus Christ.

And if you go out to our mission fields today, you will find that the primary and fundamental things is just this. Here is young John Irwin, who goes over into Afghanistan, allowed to go as interpreter with an oil man invited by the Government and going because it gives him his evangelistic opportunity, who no sooner gets to Herat than he asks the governor if he can have an opportunity, to meet with the

Moslem ecclesiastics of the city. He wrote us telling of his consternation when later the governor called him into the room and there were all the Moslem ecclesiastics of the city, old gray beards, gathered there, and this young stripling on his first term of missionary service, only three years on the field, confronting that company. It was given to him in that hour what to say. With Christian tact he suggested modestly that he supposed they would like to know why he was a Christian and he told them about his Lord Jesus Christ in words that aroused no antagonism, but only such a desire that when he departed, he left behind him written Gospels that they might learn more of Him of Whom he had told them so simply and lovingly that day. Around the world this is what the missionary enterprise is. It is the direct attempt by life, by word, by deed, just by the presence of men and women who are living and loving Christ, to make Christ and His Gospel known to the whole world to which they go.

Now, evangelism is not merely a matter of thus orally speaking of Christ, it is a matter of the Christian home, it is a matter of Christian contacts, it is a matter of the training of Christian children, in perpetual object lessons of Christian love in human service in the penetration of every agency, education and medicine, by the evangelistic purpose.

Now, you would be amazed if I were to read here tonight many of the letters that have been coming in in recent weeks indicating how easily people are disturbed and misled. We get letters protesting against the expenditure of a single dollar on the mission field for any school or for any form of educational work. Why, what is the preaching of the Gospel but teaching? Our Lord taught, taught, taught, and again and again, the preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles was the teaching of the Gospel. You cannot preach without teaching. Can you build up a real Christian church unless you have Bible reading members of that church? And when you take a great illiterate mass among whom your work is started, how are you going to get a Bible reading church if you don't have schools that at least can teach boys, girls, and men and women how to read the Bible? The very first missionaries saw this instinctively. John Lowrie,

as soon as he went up to Lodriana started a little school; Calvin Mateer, as soon as he got into Shantung, started a little school, and he started it on a basis that you would not for a moment think of approving today. He couldn't get any pupils except non-Christians, because there was no Christian community as yet. He could not get them to come except by paying them to come, and Calvin Mateer began the best piece of educational missionary work we had in China by gathering a few non-Christian boys together whom he had to pay to attend his school. You must have schools. All over the world, as any missionary here would tell you, if you would trace back the influences that brought men and women into the Christian church, I was going to say nine even out of ten (that would be too much, in lands like Korea and India, where there have been great mass movements) but in some other lands, from half to two thirds of the Christian converts could be traced back to schools. There, in the school, the boy or girl was won to Christ, or there, in the school, the seed was sown that afterwards came to fruit in maturity.

If you were to say, however, that we were to have no non-Christian education, then you would say what is absolutely true. Education is an indispensable agency of the missionary enterprise, but non-Christian education is no part of the duty of the missionary enterprise. Only, how difficult that problem is. It is a very easy thing to say education should be Christian, but how hard it is to make it Christian here in America, and it is not less hard out on the mission field. If there is any way in which mission schools can be made more thoroughly evangelistic than they are, if there is any process by which they can be made more powerfully fruitful in winning men and women, and boys and girls to the Christian faith, we are eager to discover that method. I know there are those who disavow any such purpose in missionary education. They say that the attempt to win these boys and girls to Christ would be proselytizing, and proselytizing is not what we are out in the mission field to do! Well, it is very easy to damn a great duty by an unfavorable word. If you mean by proselytizing that we are there simply to effect a nominal change that has no spiritual reality back of it,

yes, nobody is out to do that kind of thing; but if you mean by proselytizing the attempt by every possible influence and effort that is right to win men and women, and boys and girls to Christ, that is precisely what we are on the mission field to do, and in every school that is maintained by our Church this is understood, and every pressure is brought to bear to accomplish this result. Mission schools are to have the evangelistic purpose and the evangelistic result as part of their aim and their ever daily practice.

And does anybody have any doubt about the validity of making Christ known by healing deeds of love and mercy the world around? I wish we might all be transported tonight into some one of the great missionary hospitals to watch the crowds of simple folk come in to the waiting room before they pass into the consulting room, to go into the chapel and hear the Gospel being preached there, to go down the long white wards and see the Bible women at work, and the doctor who is stopping now and again to speak about Christ to those who look to him as something more than man. I have coveted again and again such an influence in commending Christ as I have seen in some of these medical missionaries. Dear old Dr. Holmes, to whom I owed my own life more than thirty-five years ago, in Persia, was a doctor whose work preached Christ. He was, I suppose, the most powerful intellectual apologist for Christianity there was in Persia at the time, and he was also one of its most beautiful and persuasive exponents. An old, blind Persian woman said once as she looked out on the world after he had given her back her sight, "Miss Montgomery, do you know, when Dr. Holmes' fingers were on my face before ever I could see I thought they were the very fingers of Christ." And I think of my cousin, Joe Cook, from Pottstown here, who died of typhus fever in Hamadan not long ago, contracted by going out into the street and picking up a poor, old diseased beggar woman from the street and carrying her with his own hands into his hospital, though he knew it might, as indeed it did, cost him his life, and who indefatigably by deed and word witnessed to Christ. I think of a man like Dr. Vail, as fine a spirit as you can find, one of the ablest surgeons in the world, and day after day in his hospital there at

Miraj, where Dr. Wanless was before him, doing not more operating on men's bodies than he is doing in the way of leading their hearts to the Saviour. And I think of it all as incorporated in just one pathetic expression of an Indian villager who came back to Dr. Wanless in the hospital once after his old father had died, whose life Dr. Wanless had saved, and said, "Dr. Wanless, you taught us a great deal about Christian living when we were in the hospital, but you didn't give us any forms to use when we buried our dead, and when my old father went from us and we took him out to lay him, wrapped up in his white cloth, in the grave, I couldn't think of the right words, and I simply said, 'We bury our father in the name of Jesus Christ and Dr. Wanless'." It was clear enough what names he had got associated as in the hospital day after day he saw the greatest surgeon of Southern India at work, not more with medical skill than with patience and love, communicating Christ.

Now, our medical and educational work was severely criticized, as you know, by "Re-Thinking Missions", on the ground that it was too evangelistic. The contention was that we should banish the evangelistic aim and endeavor from our hospitals and our colleges. We never will banish the evangelistic aim and endeavor from our hospitals and our schools and colleges. They exist as integral parts of the missionary undertaking. If they are not fulfilling their mission it is not because of any want of purpose or any want of conviction, but just because of the enormous inherent difficulties that anyone will have to contend with who will honestly attempt to essay a task instead of merely criticising those who are laying down their lives in attempting to do it.

I have spoken now of our evangelistic aim as the great essential method. Let me go on to the second point that the World Dominion Movement is emphasizing, the building up of independent, autonomous living churches. Now, are you or are you not surprised at the attitude of mind that we are meeting in some parts of our Church today that maintains that we ought to extend the American Presbyterian Church over the world and make these churches in other lands only parts and adjuncts subservient to the

Presbyterian Church in America, instead of trying to build up in these different lands autonomous, independent, self-sustaining national churches? How did we begin here in America? Why, we organized this Presbytery here in Philadelphia by no man's leave. The Church of Scotland did not organize this Presbytery. Those men got together and organized themselves into the first Presbytery here, and don't you think the same spirit glows in the breasts of these new Christians out in these different lands? The strongest church we have in the mission field never had any connection with our Church in this country, I mean the Church in Korea. The missionaries organized a little company which had no real ecclesiastical standing, and they performed all the functions of a church until the Church in Korea was capable of being set up as a purely independent agency. I have heard men resist this idea. I heard an old missionary, happily not of our denomination, once argue against self-support on the mission field because he said, "If you let these people support themselves they will think for themselves, and they are not to be trusted with thinking for themselves, and the only way you can keep them from thinking for themselves and do their thinking for them is by keeping them financially dependent." Well, we have got far away, I think, from that idea in most of our missions, and the glory of our missionary enterprise is that our Church has had a larger part in establishing these living national churches all over the world than any other Church on earth.

One of my first memories of our Board was when Dr. J. A. Hodge and Dr. Charles Knox came back from the errand on which our General Assembly had sent them to Brazil to establish the independent Church in Brazil. And all across the world now there are these real autonomous and free churches, and built on the Bible, built on the Bible, I say. If there is any one of them not adequately rooted in the Bible, then all our effort must be made to make sure that that is the foundation stone on which every one of these union churches is builded. And these Churches are raising up their own great leaders. I think of the men I have known, Ibuka and Uemura in Japan; Braga, Pereira and Alvares Reis in Brazil, Moyalet in Mexico, - all over the

world, I could name them, - Dr. Chatterjee some of you will recall, that venerable old apostle from India, - men the peers of any Christian men you can find on earth, as well qualified to lead these Churches as any men are to lead the Churches of the West. And not the great leaders only, but there have been the martyrs, also. Church after church that has grown out of the work of our missionaries carries the sign of God's blessing upon it because of the role of its martyred dead, as well as its faithful living, who in these fields have joyfully laid down their lives for the Saviour and for the Cross.

And now, just a word about the third of the great ideals, because that troubles a great many of our people. The World Dominion is insisting in all its literature, - it is publishing the most effective survey documents we have at the present - on its idea of the adequate apportionment of the world, so that there is no conflict or overlapping or duplication, so that the whole work is done and that we do together the things that we never can do as well separately. Now, that is no new idea. When foreign missionary work began in America - you know the American Board was organized in 1812 - that Board tried to persuade our Church to organize a missionary board of its own, and our Church was not ready to do it at that time, so that we did our work in the American Board until 1817, when we organized with the Dutch Reformed and the Associated Reformed churches, the United Missionary Society, which lasted only ten years, and then was absorbed by the American Board, and when at last we did in 1837 organize our board, the General Assembly and the first agents of the board laid down as a principle that this was not a competitive movement of ours, that we were starting out just to do our duty as a Church, and we were going to do it in cooperation with all other Christian bodies around the world. If you want to know where the ecclesiastical justification of this idea is to be found, it is to be found in part in Charles Hodge's review of Cardinal Manning's "Unity of the Christian Church", published in the Princeton Review of 1847, and republished in his Church Polity. There is the ideal of the Christian Church which lies behind the whole

spirit of cooperation and evangelical union which has dominated our missionary history from the beginning. I could read you here if there were time such deliverances of the Assembly year after year. I will not go back of 1900, when it was declared in as plain language as men could use what the fundamental ideal of our missionary enterprise must be in its relation to other missionary bodies. We were told there, and these are instructions that we cannot disobey, we were told there just what our General Assembly's ideal was: "The object of the foreign missionary enterprise is not to perpetuate on the mission field the denominational distinctions of Christendom, but to build up on Scriptural lines and according to Scriptural principles and methods the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ." And one of the last declarations was in the General Assembly at Grand Rapids, of which Dr. Macartney was Moderator, where the chairman of the Foreign Missionary Committee was Dr. Gordon MacLennan, which had on it also Dr. Wilson, which laid down again for our guidance the principle that we must not depart from the actions taken by previous General Assemblies in the matter of cooperation and union with other missionary agencies.

Now, there are dangers, unmistakable dangers, but, my friends, the dangers are two-fold. On the one hand there is the danger, of course, of compromise, of being carried away by the influence of others But there is the other danger, if you hold aloof, that others may involve you in difficulties which you might have prevented and that you may forfeit to the Christian cause and to the evangelical faith influences that you could control if you stood a little closer together. Let me put it all just in one personal illustration. Dr. George Pierson here will remember it well. They had years ago in Japan one of the most powerful men I ever knew, Dr. Masahisa Uemura, powerful intellectually, powerful spiritually. There was a time when it seemed that he might be drifting away from the old solid, evangelical moorings and there were missionaries in Japan who wanted to cut loose from him to distrust him, and have nothing more to do with him. There were others who had a wiser view. They said, "No, hold fast to him, keep close to him, we will

hold him still," and the result was that he developed into one of the greatest Bibraltars of evangelical conviction and of the Reformed faith that you could find anywhere in the far East. There are dangers, and the dangers are two-fold and the ideal of our Church has always been that it was not afraid. We had our own real convictions, and we were not going to abate them for anybody. We would go into cooperative measures on that basis. If we found that we could not secure the prevalence of true evangelical ideas then sooner or later it must be our duty to withdraw, but only after we had exhausted every resource and had become convinced that there was no hope that we could hold these influences that might seem to be wavering for the evangelical cause.

Then we come lastly to the matter of our problems that are present today. There is, first of all, of course, the problem of our personnel, and a great deal that we have heard has had to do with the personnel of our missionary force. Well, this is fundamental. Somebody asked John Lawrence once in the Punjab by what methods they had saved the Punjab in the days of the Indian Meeting and Lawrence replied, "It was not by our methods, it was by our men." And the glory of our missionary enterprise has been its men - the long, long roll that one would like to name here tonight of the men and women in the course of a hundred years who have gone out to represent our Church across the world and the older ones, noble as they were, not surpassing the younger ones, who are following them now. Indeed, it is a lovely thing to get the tributes from the old missionaries with regard to the quality of the young men and the young women who are coming out to join them and to take over the burden when they are gone. I do not know one of our missionaries who does not believe fundamentally in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. If there is one who does not, he ought to be exposed, and no such missionary has any place in the ranks of our body of representatives on the foreign mission field. And I don't know one of them whose views of inspiration are not inside of Henry Clay Trumbull's book, "Our Misunderstood Bible", my copy of which was given me by his son many years ago, within the bounds of Dr. F. L. Patton's "Fundamental Christianity", on pages 161 to 173, within the bounds of Robert Ellis Thompson's "History of the Presbyterian Churches", page

262, within the bounds of A. A. Hodge's "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes", page 92, I wish you could just turn back and read those four documents. Could I name four men who commanded more the confidence of our church than those four, and I say again I do not know any missionary whose views of inspiration are not within the bounds which I have named in those four books. If anybody knows one he ought to be named.

Now, a few missionaries have been named within the last few months as missionaries regarding whom investigation should be made. Let me tell you the result. One of them was at once consulted, the matter was taken up with him, and the missionary, the fellow-missionary who made the charges withdrew them all and honorably apologized to the men whom he concluded he had unjustly accused.

In the case of two more the matter was referred to the judicatories of jurisdiction and in each case the men were absolutely vindicated.

In the case of another the person making the charge was unwilling to uncloak the identity of the accuser, but I took the matter up with the man myself and got from him the most explicit declaration that he accepted the whole New Testament representation of the Christian gospel and the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There are several others with whom we are corresponding but I believe it to be a simple, indisputable fact that no more faithful, loyal, evangelical group can be found than the foreign missionaries of our own Church.

If there be any missionaries of our Church who are unfaithful to their ordination vows or the pledges that they took when they went to the mission field, they ought to be known, and if they are known then they ought to be dealt with according to the proper constitutional procedure established in the law of our Church.

But there are problems that lie behind these. Three great issues confront us. Are we going to be able to find ⁱⁿ the years that lie ahead the missionaries who are needed to carry on the work abroad? Well, you saw, some of you, the letter that appeared in The Presbyterian the other day signed by twelve students in Princeton Seminary, among the best students there, appealing to the Church to be sent. I don't see how

anybody can read that letter without deep feeling as these young men appeal to the Church to take their lives that they want to give. I have another document here signed by fifteen or twenty volunteers in the Middle West making just the same appeal to the Church. Here they stand at the door of the foreign mission field, the best lives we have got, offering themselves to the Church, and there are some of them, as you know, who have been paying their own way through their times of preparation sacrificially. We have got three or four medical candidates who have been buying their medical course by giving their own blood in transfusions. And now they come, having prepared themselves for the foreign missionary work, by taking up their cross in this very real sense and laying down their lives in this very real sense, and offer themselves to the Church to go abroad. No, there is not going to be any difficulty in finding young men and young women in the generation ahead who will be eager to give their lives, just as those who have gone before.

But in the second place, will there be any place for them? We are told that the Churches out in the mission field don't want them. That is not true. From all over the world appeals have come in from these churches, authoritative and responsible appeals, I like the manliness of the tone of the Japanese Christians in their last great national gathering, when they said, "We don't want missionaries here who will only come if we send them an invitation to come, we want men and women to come out here who are driven by an inward urge, who feel it to be their duty to go across the world whether they are asked for or not." Who asked Paul to go when he saw a man in the dream? And we know what happened when he responded to that call and went over. What kind of welcome did he get? Missionaries are not conditioned in their obligations by the attitude of mind of those to whom they ought to go. They are charged by their Lord under a great commission to go everywhere. Everywhere across the world they must go.

There is the other question as to whether the Church at home is going to send them. Well, my friends, that is for the Church to answer. There are denominations

that believe that their missionary work is drawing to its close, and I have friends in other missionary boards who think that they must reconcile themselves now to a policy of continuing contraction and withdrawal. God forbid. In the world that we are looking out on today, needing Christ as much as the world ever needed Him, filled with want, with great problems and abysmal necessities that only Christ can meet, surely the Church is not going to turn back now from her Lord's commission. There are great difficulties undoubtedly both at home and abroad. Here are our divisions at home that are dissipating energy and diverting the attention of the people from the great central aim, when we ought to stand together. We ought to stand together. Why do we divide in the face of the great common enemy when we do stand together on the great, central indispensable rock of Christ? There are the divisions here at home. There is the growing narrowness of national spirit, the talk about a self-contained America sending nothing out and bringing nothing in, staying here inside our own borders. And all over the land there is the fear, economic fear and social fear, people not knowing what the future holds. Yes, it is a grave situation at home and it is a grave situation abroad. William Hung of China described the four great difficulties that they are meeting in China as scientific agnosticism, materialistic determinism, political fascism and moral iconoclasm. Or you can diagnose it otherwise as nationalism, naturalism, secularism, humanism, and communism. One of our statements from China this last week said that there are two men on every road in China today. One is preaching Karl Marx, and the other is preaching Jesus Christ. Well, that puts it extremely, but it presents the great and fundamental issue of the world in which we are living today, the struggle between Christ as the only Saviour of the world, and those great systems of opinion of life which bar Christ out and which doom humanity forever.

There is our issue today. There appeared in one of the European magazines just a little while ago, "The Student World", a striking article by one of the men whom I think our generation could least afford to lose, Mr. William Martin. He was editor of the Journal of Geneva. He died in Zurich just a few months ago. He was a Christian man,

who interpreted the world in which we are living now in Christian terms, and who saw no hope for it except the Christian hope. He had just been out in China. He came back to say that this is the most gigantic struggle that had ever taken place in the history of the world. There in China the two great living forces of the world were locked in this great life and death grapple, Communism, with all the malign forces behind it pouring out of Russia, and Christianity, and he said the future of China and the future of the world was going to hang on the issue of this struggle, on whether or not we can recover the primitive revolutionary forces of the Christian Gospel, and release them in the world in which we are living today. In the face of such a struggle Christ bids his disciples to unite and love.

I might stop there, but there are two other words I want to add. First of all, what was the great test that our Lord laid down for fidelity, for loyalty, for the tying of all things? "By their fruits ye shall know them." By its fruits judge our missionary enterprise of the last one hundred years. By its fruits judge that enterprise today. You cannot find on earth anything to surpass the work of love, of unselfishness, of kindness, of gentleness, of fidelity, of the proclamation of Jesus Christ and the manifestation of Christ in the lives of men and women that is presented in the missionary enterprise to which, thank God, you and I have been related across these years that are gone.

The one other word has to do with another great saying of Jesus Christ. It isn't much spoken of, one finds, in missionary gatherings, indeed, I don't think it was referred to in any one of the three recent missionary gatherings held here in this city and neighborhood. I am referring to the relationship of the whole missionary undertaking to the second coming of our Lord. I am one of those Christians who believe that Jesus Christ is coming back again, and who is daily watching for His coming. I rest on the miracle of His Virgin birth, on the miracle of His resurrection and His ascension, on the miracle of His second coming again. The supernatural has no difficulties for me with three great rock-like miracles such as these on which to rest my

faith. And I think again and again of our Saviour's words, "This gospel of the Kingdom", He says, "must first be preached as a witness among all nations and then shall the end come." What is this Gospel of the Kingdom? Well, the shortest definition of the Kingdom, of course, is Saint Paul's, "The Kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." When this Gospel of the Kingdom shall have been preached as a witness among all nations then shall the end come. The end of what? Well, I don't know what things it is to be the end of, but there is one thing that I do know it is to be the end of, it is to be the end of the separations, because when He comes, they also who sleep in Him will He bring with Him. And there are many of us here tonight who are longing for that day when the separations shall be over, when the faces loved long since, and lost a while will be given back to us again.

I believe in the second coming, the glorious reappearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, and I love this missionary enterprise because while I do not understand all that is involved I know that in some strange way beyond the feebleness of our interpretation, these things are bound together, the end of death, the end of sin, the end of wrong, the end of hate, the end of division, the end of the long, long partings, and our Lord's return, when this Gospel of the Kingdom shall have been preached as a witness to all the nations.

My friends, there is a place of unity. I cannot say how large the area is, but I can describe it to you. It is a region so large or so small that wherever you stand in it you see the Cross of Christ, a region so large or so small that wherever you stand in it you hear the joyous cry, "Christ is risen, Christ is risen." Thither let us all resort, and ~~holding~~ hand in hand, there kneel down in completeness of surrender and new loyalty to our one and only Lord, Jesus Christ. May His Spirit control us every one.

{The Commission believes that the recognition of the principle of constitutional liberty, (when rightly conceived and frankly and fairly applied), will meet the present situation, and that this belief is justified in the light of our experience.} Toleration is as truly a part of our constitution as are any of the other doctrines stated in that instrument. Toleration is expressed in definite terms, and its place and authority as a part of our organic laws are further indicated through its appearance in a number of the articles by clear and necessary implication. Furthermore, it is recognized through unbroken practice in the administration of our form of government and our discipline.

As a principle applicable within the Presbyterian Church toleration refers to an attitude and a practice according to which the status of a Presbyterian minister ^{is} acknowledged, and fellowship is extended to him, even though he may hold some views that are individual and uncommon, on points not regarded as of the substance of the faith which the church professes. In some instances such a brother may believe sincerely that he is in full accord with the body of doctrine to which the church witnesses. In other instances he may be conscious of standing somewhat apart from his brethren in certain respects, but not far enough apart to place him outside the pale of the Church.

or essential to the system
Presbyterianism ^{is probably} is more than a belief; it is also a tradition, and a controlling sentiment. The ties which bind us to it are not of the mind only; they are ties of the heart as well. There are people who, despite variant opinions, can never be at home in any other communion. They were born into the Presbyterian Church. They love its name, its order, and its great distinctive teachings. In its fellowship they have a precious inheritance from their forbears. Their hearts and sentiments like these are treasures which should be not

undervalued hastily nor cast aside lightly. A sound policy of constitutional toleration is designed to conserve such assets whenever it is possible so to do without endangering the basic positions of the Church.

Our constitution, like the tables of the law, has two aspects. It deals not only with our duties to God, but also with our relations to each other, and these are equally imperative. Our Lord Himself condensed all the commandments into two, which are specific on the divine and human relationships, and said, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets". [It is our belief that one of the chief causes of unrest among us is the undue emphasis placed on one of the other of these two. One of the most convincing arguments for the extension of the church in the early days was the evidence of its power to soften antagonism, so that the world said,—"Behold how these christians love one another."] The church at large should illustrate, as well as demonstrate, the power of the gospel to bind up wounds and to soften animosities; and such, we are convinced, was the purpose of incorporating in the Presbyterian constitution, the obligation for bretheren to maintain a patient, considerate and brotherly attitude toward each other.

The ^{various groups} (most partisen) in the present ^{dissensions in} (dissensions) ^{declare their} profess approval of and adherence to our constitution. These ^{declarations} professions must be accepted as sincere. All therefore, assert that the constitution is the only adequate test of Presbyterianism. The church has many times solved its difficulties by this criterion alone. ~~Why is it not adequate now?~~

Of course, the liberty which toleration allows is not to be judged finally by individuals. It is freedom with boundaries, and these boundaries are fixed by ^{constituted} authority. Toleration is the self-imposed restraint which an organized body lays upon its own action. Either

by a written constitution or by prevailing practice an organization draws lines beyond which it pledges itself not to pass. It delimits areas which it will not invade, and within these areas the individual member of the organization has freedom. The entire body exercises its own liberty first, in voluntarily circumscribing the field of its action, and this, in turn, guarantees the liberty of the individual outside of such limits.

It follows, therefore, that whenever a question arises as to where these limits are, the issue must be decided by the organization and not by the individual member of it. As applied within the Presbyterian Church, this means that such issues will be determined either generally, by amendment of the constitution, or particularly, by judicial procedure in specific cases, with such limitations as belong to this latter method, some of which are discussed in a later part of this report.

111.

The Obligation to Respect the Differing
Views of Others.

As this report deals chiefly, if not exclusively with questions of constitutional obligations, we do not take into account the scriptural duty of individuals as between themselves. It is our function only to consider the question whether such an obligation exists by virtue of the standards of the church and their several interpretations.

In the adoption act by which the Synod of New York adopted the present standards as the criterion of doctrine for the Church, in a paragraph preceding the adopting section, this is stated:

" We do also agree, that all the Presbyteries within our bounds shall always take care not to admit any candidate for the ministry into the exercise of the sacred function unless he declares his agreement in opinion with all the essential and necessary articles of said Confession. x x And in case any minister of this Synod, or any candidate for the ministry, shall have any scruple with respect to any article or articles of said Confession or Catechisms, he shall at the time of his making said declaration declare

his sentiments to the Presbytery or Synod, who shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry within our bounds, and to ministerial communion, if the Synod or Presbytery shall judge his scruple or mistake to be only about articles not essential and necessary in doctrine, worship or government."

Digest, Vol. 2, pp.4-5.

The confession of Faith in paragraph LXXI, dealing with the subject of Synods and Councils, indicates that their conclusions are not always without error, or to be so taken. It is this:

"All Synods or Councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err and many have erred; Therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith and practice, but to be used as a help in both".

The first General Assembly, as a prefix to its adoption of the Form of Government, in 1788, said:

"They (the first Assembly) also believe that there are truths and forms with respect to which men of good characters and principles may differ, and in these they think it the duty of both private christians and societies to exercise mutual forbearance toward each other." Vol. I, Digest of 1922, p/ 74.

The General Assembly of 1896 said, with reference to the doctrinal standards:

"Along with this insistence upon this unique supremacy of the Holy Scriptures there is in the standards the acknowledgment of human fallibility. Christian churches and their judicatories being composed of fallible men may err. This admission of liability to err, however, is simply the declaration by the church of its dependence upon the divine author of the Scriptures for the guidance of his spirit in the interpretation of his word, and in the formulation and application of its standards." Vol. 2, Digest of 1922, p. 12

Immediately following the union with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church the Joint General Assembly (1906) made plain its conviction that differences of interpretation were to be expected. It said,-

"That ministers, ruling elders and deacons, in expressing approval of the Westminster Confession of Faith as revised in 1903, are required to assent only to the system of doctrine contained therein, and not to every particular statement in it."

Digest, Vol. 2, p. 71

A marked instance which appears to us to show that the Presbyterian standards, including the Confession of Faith, are capable of more than one construction, all consistent with a status entirely Presbyterian, is the "Declaratory Statement" of 1903, which interprets the Confession of Faith to a purport quite different from the reading previously given it by the brethren of the Cumberland Church. By the Act of Union, consented to by reason of that change, it was provided that the Cumberland people should not lose or in any way relinquish or surrender their views previously entertained. We quote from a deliverance of the Cumberland Assembly in 1906, (Digest Vol. 2, pp.71-2):

"In the Reunion and Union of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, on the doctrinal basis of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, as revised in 1903, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church does not surrender anything integral in its own system of doctrine, as set out in its own Confession of Faith, nor modify in any particular its adherence to the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; nor has the Presbyterian Church asked or expected us to do so."

And the Presbyterian Church, at the same time, adopted a resolution of like purport, from which we quote the following:

"Inasmuch as the two Assemblies meeting in 1904 did declare that there was then a sufficient agreement between the systems of doctrine contained in the Confession of the two Churches to warrant the Union of the Churches, therefore the change of doctrinal Standards resulting from the Union involves no change of belief on the part of any who were ministers, ruling elders, or deacons in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church." Vol. 2, Digest of 1922, p. 71

It seems to us to follow from all the foregoing, and much other material to like effect, that by the constitution of our church, as the same now is, the obligation of fraternal regard for differing views within the church is as much a part of the duty of a Presbyterian as the obligation to maintain the faith; and that it is no departure from the intent and meaning of the said Standards, or the interpretation put upon them both in language and practice by the church over a long period of years, to believe that such differences of view are within the contemplation of our organic system as well with reference to those who have never separated from it, as with those who, by our invitation, have united with us on this assurance.

THE JOURNAL OF THE COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF 1925.

The Commission has carefully studied, as instructed by the General Assembly, and its present spiritual condition (See Paper A) the causes of unrest in our Church, and with a view to proper report to the assembly it has made a careful survey of the history of our Church from the beginning, and has examined the constitutional and legal aspects of the questions which have been before recent meetings of the assembly ^{which} and have so deeply concerned the Church. The Commission has had before it the reports of ^{three} ~~five~~ sub-committees of its members dealing with these matters. It has not adopted these as part of its report but ^{herewith} submits them ^{As Papers A, B, and C.} for the information of the Church. Its own report it has made as brief and clear as possible and presents it in the following terms.

1. The first question is as to the principle and limits of tolerance in the Church. A few would require a literal and complete acceptance of the ineluctable verba of the Confession of Faith and of the Catechism and would tolerate nothing else. Others would tolerate only those of their own general temper and mode of interpretation and would require a measure of conformity at variance with the principles which are clearly embodied in the history and policy of the Church in its reunion experiences. Others would adhere to the principles of tolerance embodied in our reunions and believe that there are no current views of teaching of which the Church as a whole needs to take cognizance which pass beyond the boundaries of these principles. There are others who believe that there are current views of teaching which pass beyond the limits of tolerance as recognized by our Church and that those who hold these views should peaceably withdraw. Still others believe that our principle of tolerance should be expanded to make room for ^a new and further interpretations of the old standards, but the Commission has heard from no one who is willing to allow

that he depart from these standards or who is asking for any change in them.

The Commission feels that the principle of tolerance embodied in the history of the Church in its experiences of union and reunion is adequate to cover our present situation, unless there are specific cases of doctrinal defection which should be dealt with in constitutional manner, and that it is the mind of the Church as a whole that both our traditional position in this matter and the historical unity of our Church should be preserved unruptured.

2. The witness of our Church to the Christian faith is unmistakably clear. Our standards are open for the whole world to read. The brief statement has put our fundamental teaching in plain terms for men and women of the present day. Our final standard, the Holy Scriptures, in whose veracity and trustworthiness we believe, is in every home. There can be no uncertainty as to the corporate teaching of our Church as to the truth of the Deity of our Lord, His Virgin Birth, His miracles, His atoning death, His resurrection, His ascension into glory and the promise of His return. The historic and corporate testimony of the Church is what it is, and we have heard no proposal that it should be altered. No such proposal has ever entered the thought of the Commission, and we are assured that it is not in the thought of the Church. Our Church stands on the great Rock of the Deity of Christ as witnessed in the Holy Scriptures and in the life of the Church and on the summary of doctrine in our standards and in the great affirmations of the Apostles' Creed.

3. Our Commission thinks that it discerns a difference between the expression of our Church's testimony in her moving life and work and such doctrinal deliverances of the General Assembly as those of 1910 and 1924 on the one hand and the constitution and standards of the Church on the other, and we are persuaded that some of our present difficulties may be due to the loss of sight of this difference. The Church may, by General Assembly deliverance and in other ways, utter

its corporate witness, and such witness is the legitimate expression by the witnessing body of its interpretation of its standards. More than this it cannot be. (See Paper B) The standards are and must continue to be subject to the Scriptures, the supreme authority applied in every concrete situation by the due processes of constitutional procedure.

4. It is this question of constitutional procedure which has occasioned some of our present divergence of view in the matter of the nature and limits of the rights of Presbyteries and the General Assembly with regard to licensure and ordination. In one aspect the issue involved is a clear question of constitutional law, but it has other aspects, and a decision either way will involve far reaching results as to the character and functions of the Presbytery on the one side and of the General Assembly on the other, and as to the balance between local self-government and centralized authority in the General Assembly. Other matters than licensure and ordination are likely to be involved. As a constitutional question, the issue, with all that it includes, requires the most competent and dispassionate study. Such study should be given to it both by the Presbytery and by the appropriate agencies of the General Assembly, and at some future period it should be taken up in a way that will secure the wise settlement of issues which affect the fundamental character of the Church as at once a democratically and an organically responsible body.

Meanwhile, it must be decided what course the Presbyteries and the General Assembly shall pursue in the light of the judicial decision of the last General Assembly. Herein we have sought the best constitutional counsel we could secure to ascertain the exact significance and force of such decision. The ~~only~~ ^{advice} of this counsel

~~is~~ is

(See Paper C.)

What then is the wise course for us to pursue? The judgment of your Commission is:

(1) That with true loyalty to our inheritance of Presbyterian order and unity, we lay aside all strife and dissension and seek not for division but for concord.

(2) That we adhere faithfully to our own standards, refraining from extra confessional terminology and requirements and bringing all things to the test and the word of the Spirit of God.

(3) That we seek for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church men who can joyfully declare their belief in the great affirmations of our Faith.

(4) That we all faithfully uphold the constitution and standards of the Church, and above all, the glorious Deity and Lordship of our Saviour.

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE

There remain two subjects, both of which lie among the causes of unrest in the church, as to which, for the reasons mentioned below, we are not prepared to submit any report as the definitive action of the Commission. One of these relates to the power of a General Assembly to review and control the Presbyteries in dealing with the reception of candidates for licensure or ordination. The other relates to the correct definition of the term "essential", either as to truth or doctrine.

As to the first of these questions, the adverse contention is that the jurisdiction over this subject is, by our Form of Government, (Chap. Sec.), committed to the Presbyteries, with no express reservation; also that provision is not made for the certification of a record of the questions propounded to and answered by the candidate, and none for the re-examination of the candidate on appeal; also that it is provided that the Presbytery shall be "satisfied".

On these grounds, chiefly, it is contended on the one part that it was intended to make the judgment of the Presbytery final.

On the other hand, it is contended that by our Form of Government, (Chap.XIV; Sec.IV), and also by our Book of Discipline, (Chap.Ix; Sec.74), it is provided in general terms that the General Assembly may review the action of the Presbytery, when carried up in due form, without stating any exception; also that it is by the same standards provided that the General Assembly shall be the final judge on questions of doctrine,- using this language, -

"To the General Assembly belong the power of deciding all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline."

Such appeals usually involve questions of doctrine, and frequently no others, and therefore that language is applicable, it is also argued that as our church is organic, and ministers, when admitted, have a general status. no one Presbytery can properly be allowed to settle that question free from the control of the body as a whole. It is also said that the absence of a requirement for an official record of the evidence is not conclusive, because the facts can always be ascertained, and in the past have been, without serious conflict as to their verity.

The question of the proper meaning of the term "essential truth" also remains undecided in the commission, for analogous reasons.

The Commission has not as yet been able to agree which contention on each of these questions is of greater weight, and under ordinary circumstances would be disposed to ask further time for consideration. Since, however, the resolution for the appointment of the Commission requests a report at this session; and because it is urged on the Commission that the good of the Church requires prompt action; and also because, for reasons elsewhere stated, a report on either question even if confirmed by the General Assembly, would be inconclusive as to future cases unless and until acted upon by the Presbyteries, it has been deemed best to submit to the General Assembly whether it be its will that the Commission give further consideration to these questions or would deem it wise to deal with them as the church has repeatedly done in the past by allowing them to wait while they continue abstract; or whether if the Assembly deem present action upon them imperative, it might prefer to deal with them by its own method.

To enable the Assembly to consider either question in the same form as they came before the Commission, we respectfully report that the following was proposed as the action it was suggested we should adopt.

As to The General Assembly's Right of Review and Control

"As to this right or power, which has been much questioned, it seems to us the law of the church is fairly clear. The question arises in two aspects,- (a) as to the effect of "Deliverances" by the Assembly, in non-judicial cases,- i. e.,- as to matters not brought up by appeal, but originating in the Assembly or in answer to inquiries from synods or presbyteries, and in other cases where the Assembly is not convened as a court; and (b) as to decisions in judicial cases, brought up on appeal, and dealt with on report of the Judicial Commission, after a hearing of the parties concerned.

Both these methods are well supported in practice, and are regarded by the church as useful. The difference is not merely formal but essential. "Deliverances" cannot, in the nature of things, be more than advisory; otherwise they would be legislative, and would infringe the prerogative of the Presbyteries. If, when promulgated, they could be deemed a part of the body of church law they must be permanent in their nature, or else they must be subject to be repealed or modified in like manner; but either would be in conflict with the Form of Government, which confers this authority exclusively on the Presbyteries. Construing "deliverances" as being merely advisory, they accomplish their purpose, but are no part of our permanent body of law, and may be altered or revoked at will.

Adjudications are on a different footing. In those cases the Assembly is convened in solemn form as a court, and its judg-

ment concludes the issue before it. The effect to be given such a decision, especially the distinction between the judgment pronounced and the reasons given for that conclusion, are explained elsewhere. It remains only to apply that resume of church law to special cases questioning such control, especially in respect to the reception of new candidates into the ministry.

It is first to be noted on this point that the Presbyterian Church, in its administration as well as its doctrine, is organic. It is a compact, constitutional government, and not, since the adopting act, a confederation of Presbyteries. Accordingly its rules of procedure as well as its body of doctrine apply throughout its jurisdiction, and concern the church as a whole. We have substantially three hundred Presbyteries. Each has the power to receive and ordain ministers. When a minister is ordained his relations and functions are not exclusively to the Presbytery which admitted him, but are the same everywhere. It is true a given congregation may not desire to invite him, and any Presbytery may decline to admit him to its membership, but this does not affect the present question. From this two results follow:

(a) The whole church is interested in seeing that every minister so admitted is properly qualified in character, in piety, and in devotion to the system of doctrine which the church as a whole accepts.

(b) The whole church is concerned in seeing that there is, as far as possible, a constant flow of new and qualified persons into its ministry, so that all its churches may be suitably equipped.

Solidarity and uniformity cannot exist unless there is authority to see to it that essentially the same tests of admission

prevail everywhere, and are duly administered. Unless it be the General Assembly there is in our church no body qualified to exercise this supervisory jurisdiction.

The foregoing are general propositions, but they aid in construing the rules laid down in our standards, especially the Form of Government, which provides for appeals from Presbytery to the General Assembly. The right to entertain such appeals, without designation of subjects, and without limitation, is conferred by the Form of Government, (Chap. XIV; Sec. IV); and its equivalent is found in the Book of Discipline, Chap. IX, Sec. 74.

That questions of doctrine, wherever they may arise, are included in this provision is indicated by Chap. XII, Sec. V of the Form of Government, which provides:

"To the General Assembly belongs the power of deciding all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline."

An appeal from Presbytery growing out of its action in a heresy trial (excluding from the ministry) involves the question as to what is the doctrine of the church, and whether or not in the given case it has been applied. The converse is the case arising on an appeal from the admission of a given person to the ministry (reception into the ministry). Whether the tests applied in the Presbytery have, in a given case, been those required by the constitution of the church must, on such appeal, be judged and determined; and as no higher authority is provided the decision of the General Assembly must be conclusive in the case at issue.

Long and uniform practice is a convincing argument, and so far as we can learn, while there has been much individual argument to the contrary, the right to appeal in the case mentioned has

never been officially denied, either by a Presbytery or a General Assembly.

This view is not met by the requirement that the Presbytery shall be "satisfied", or that it shall act "at its discretion". These phrases have been often construed by the courts not to confer arbitrary but reasonable authority, especially where a court is the party to be satisfied; and the decision on this point below is also subject to review.

The test or criterion of Presbyterianism mentioned elsewhere as justifying the ministerial status in the church may not be the proper test to be applied in either of the cases now being considered; for a minister or an applicant for the ministry may be found by a church court, notwithstanding his own sincere belief to the contrary, to be or have become unsound in doctrine, when compared with our standards. This condition can arise only in individual cases, and not in the mass. It is first to be examined by the Presbytery, but the final authority to deal with it, if appealed, is the General Assembly."

As to the Definition of the term "Essential"

We believe that the considerations mentioned elsewhere in our report define sufficiently for the present purpose the term "essential" as applied to questions of truth or doctrine. The long and consistent practice of the church, illustrated especially at each of our most recent reunions, where the substance of the question was involved, and where it was dealt with by both Assemblies, and also by the Presbyteries of both denominations, has interpreted this as intended to mean essential to the

Presbyterian system, as a whole. We have already seen that from the beginning provision has been made in our constitution for varying judgments. The word "essential" is used in the adopting act in that very connection, and therefore could not have been understood to mean essential to any particular view of a question in difference. The presbyterian system has always been characterized by marked features which we need not here discuss, which differentiate it from others. One who departs from these, or who cannot continue to accept them, is not a Presbyterian, and does not belong with the body of those who profess it; but "essential truth" or "essential doctrine" cannot possibly mean either side of ~~xxxx~~ a controverted interpretation. It was otherwise construed in the reunions, and we therefore regard this question as settled by authority.

On the question of whether the foregoing should be adopted there were in the Commission votes pro and con; and some members were unable to vote, stating that the question was one of great difficulty, for which they found no specific guide in our Form of Government. It was not overlooked in the Commission that at the last session of the General Assembly an appeal in such a case was presented, and was entertained and acted upon. The Commission refrained from discussing that decision, treating it, as they were in duty bound, as conclusive of the issue there dealt with, but believing that it could not be yet regarded as constituting a part of our permanent body of law, for application to future cases, since it could only become such by the concurrence of the requisite number of Presbyteries.

Accordingly the Commission now, for the purpose of concluding its present report, presents these questions as still awaiting conclusive action. In all other respects it regards its report as covering the whole ground committed to it.

-copye

New York, N.Y.
April 26, 1935.

Rev. Dr. Cleland B. McAfee
Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City.

Dear Dr. McAfee:

Since our talk last Saturday and indeed since your first letter reached me some days before, I have been thinking over the various aspects of the subjects we discussed.

The more I have thought, the more I have come to a very simple conclusion. It is that in the address which I gave at the Hotel Astor, and which has since been published, and elsewhere, I have already stated my convictions as clearly as I can.

As you know, I have not for some time been taking salary, and have been in the position of a regularly appointed but self-supporting missionary. It seems to be evident, however, from the recent publicity, that the presence of my name on its list of missionaries is proving embarrassing to the Board, and after various discussions there seems no reasonable course I can take except to retire from active connection with the missionary work of the Board, and therefore I ask the Board to release me.

I do this with the utmost good will for the work and for yourself and the other members of the Board, and with deep appreciation for the Board's many kindnesses in the past.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) Peeri S. Buck.

COPY

April 4th, 1933

Rev. Robert E. Speer, D. D.,
156 Fifth Avenue,
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Doctor Speer:

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, in session April 3rd, 1933, approved the Report of the Special Committee on Foreign Missions, a copy of which is enclosed. This report was approved with unanimity and enthusiasm.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) I Sturges Shultz
I. Sturges Schultz
Stated Clerk

APPROVED REPORT OF SPECIAL
COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Your Committee on Foreign Missions has given prayerful and careful consideration to the criticisms of our Board of Foreign Missions offered by the Rev. John Clover Mensma, the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, and others. These gentlemen was invited to meet with the Committee and were given unlimited time to present their views. At the request of the Committee, Messrs. Mensma and Griffiths furnished written statements of their position, hereto attached. A revised form of that of Mr. Mensma has been printed and furnished to members of Presbytery.

In addition, your Committee had before it a written reply of a representative of the Board of Foreign Missions to the criticisms, and also listened to the personal statement of Dr. Robert Littell and Dr. Cheesman Herrick, members of the Board of Foreign Missions. We also considered the "Action of the Board of Foreign Missions regarding the Report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry", Dr. Speer's survey of the Laymen's Inquiry under the title of "Re-thinking Missions Examined", and other papers bearing on the situation.

We would especially commend the straight-forward evangelical loyalty of the Board as expressed in its "Action regarding the Report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Mission Inquiry", issued under date of November 21, 1932; particularly the following statement:

The Board affirms its abiding loyalty to the evangelical basis of the missionary enterprise. The work of the Board is built on the motive described in the foreword of the Commission's Report in the words, "to some of our members the enduring motive of Christian missions can only be adequately expressed as loyalty to Jesus Christ regarded as the perfect revelation of God and the only way by which men can reach a satisfying experience of Him." The Board adheres to the aim and ideal of missionary work and to the conception of the Gospel embodied in the New Testament and in the historic witness of the Church and will continue its work on this basis, regarding Jesus Christ as the only Lord and Saviour and seeking to make Him known as the Divine Redeemer of individuals and of society. The Board has long expressed and still expresses this aim in its Manual as follows:

"The supreme and controlling aim of Foreign Missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian Churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, self-governing; to co-operate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen, and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

We commend most heartily and enthusiastically Dr. Robert E. Speer for his masterly presentation of our Church's position in his "Re-thinking Missions Examined". and we would here record our utmost confidence in his fine loyalty to our Lord and His great commission as evidenced through the years of his splendid service to the Church.

Opinions were freely expressed by the brethren presenting the criticisms, but in the judgment of your Committee sufficient proof was not offered relating to specific cases as to justify us in sustaining the criticisms.

We recommend that no action be taken on the Overture to the General Assembly proposed by Mr. Monsma; we offer the following Resolution to be transmitted to the Board of Foreign Missions:

WHEREAS, Pearl S. Buck, a missionary under appointment by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has written various articles, reviews, and letters, which are clearly at variance with the declared aims and policies of the said Church and Board, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Presbytery of Philadelphia requests the Board of Foreign Missions to ask the resignation of Mrs. Pearl S. Buck as a missionary under its care; and that it further requests the Board of Foreign Missions not to publish, advertise or distribute the mission study books for children prepared by Pearl S. Buck, as authorized by the Board.

Attest. ----- I. Sturges Shultz,
Stated Clerk
Presbytery of Philadelphia

February 20, 1935
(Dict. Feb. 16)

The Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D.D.,
7th and Spring Streets,
Seattle, Washington.

My dear Mark:

I have been thinking a great deal about you recently and have been planning to write to you and have had it in mind for today or Monday when your note of February 12 has just come in indicating that our thoughts have been passing one another across the continent.

I am not expecting to be at the meeting of the General Council in Philadelphia. Dr. McAfee is still our Board's representative on the Council. I have been in such deep disagreement with some of the policies of the Council with regard to the benevolence budget that I have been glad to be out of it. I have argued for years for what seemed to me to be the only right and true course and have been unable to convince the Council, and rather than continue to be an annoyance I thought that it was best to drop out.

The present Church situation, as you say, is a very unhappy and difficult one. Part of the mischief of it is just what you pointed out in your speech at the last General Assembly, namely, that if the Constitution of the Church is broken down at one point, the same arguments will break it down in another. Just now there seems to be a strange companionship in the Church between Dr. Machen and his group who are demanding liberty of conscience and disregard of the Constitution and the General Assembly and some other friends who are supporting them because they want to establish the principle of a much more liberal interpretation of the Constitution throughout. If one group is free in the Church to do whatever it pleases in disregard of the Courts and the law of the Church, why any other group can do the same.

There are those who have been arguing that nothing should be done, that if the movement is of God it will justify itself and that if it is not of God it will fail. The attitude of Gamaliel has been held up repeatedly. Dr. Machen and his group, however, will have nothing of this. The issue of the "Sunday School Times" of February 16 denounces Gamaliel's attitude as neutral and cowardly. Dr. Machen has announced repeatedly that this is a war and a war to the finish, and Mr. Griffiths informed the Committee of the Presbytery of Philadelphia that the only thing that would satisfy his group would be a turning out of the present personnel and the election of persons acceptable to his faction. He stated this also in our hearing before the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions at the last General Assembly.

As you may know, Dr. McAfee and I advised against the action taken by the last General Assembly when we learned of it before the Assembly. The constitutional principles set up by the General Council seem to us on the whole to be sound, although I think that they were not wholly so and that some other positions might have been taken that would have been constitutionally stronger. But the General Council and its advisers were convinced that any other course than the one taken would be merely evasive and that procrastination in asserting the law and authority of the Church would only result in worse troubles. Having taken the action that it did the General Assembly must either stand behind it or admit that it was an error. I should suppose that the wise thing would be for the Assembly to stand its constitutional ground but to allow

February 20, 1935

another year or so in which to work the matter out. Things cannot go on as they are. This particular group that is making the trouble is bound either to rule or ruin. If it is not going to stop short of division, then the wise course is to deal with matters in such a way that the division will be over the right issue and not over the wrong one. The real issue is not a doctrinal one. These friends are not more truly Bible Christians than the rest of the Church is. I do not believe they are as truly Bible Christians. There are great areas in the New Testament which they either ignore or in effect deny. The real issue is in one aspect personal and in another, simply the fundamental question as to the true Christian method of maintaining and propagating the truth. With regard to the first personal aspect of the situation I fear there can be no escape from the fact that our present troubles really root in the Princeton Seminary controversy. It is significant that Dr. Machen's animosity has been directed against the Foreign Board alone, the Board of which Dr. Erdman is President and with which Dr. Stevenson, Mr. W. P. Stevenson and I, who were on the faculty and Boards of Princeton Seminary, are connected. Our Board is, I think, beyond question the most careful and conservative agency in our Church. It has less connection with the Auburn Affirmation than any other Board. And yet almost nothing has been said by Dr. Machen and his associates in the way of attack except on the foreign missionary agencies of our Church, which have been the most careful and trustworthy and faithful. At any rate they have not been surpassed in these regards by any other agency.

As regards the larger question, I think that Dr. Machen's fundamental error is in his view of conscience. He speaks and acts as though conscience were infallible and as though his conscience must be the law for everyone else. In both of these points he is unScriptural. Conscience is not infallible. "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" And again when Christ told His disciples that the day would come when those who killed them would actually believe that they were doing service to God. Paul saw how wrong his conscience had been in his early life. It is no doubt true that a man should obey his conscience, but he should be on his guard all the time against the possibility of his being wrong. He has no right whatever to require of everyone else that their convictions must conform to his convictions and their consciences be subjected to his conscience.

Some of these friends seem to think that freedom of conscience in our Church means that a man can do anything he pleases. That has never been the view of freedom of conscience held by the Presbyterian Church. And our theory of liberty scorns the idea that each individual is free to do what seems right in his own eyes. If any one disapproves of the Presbyterian Church, he is free to leave it, but he is not free to remain in it as a source of division. This was clearly laid down in the Basis of Union in 1758. I enclose a copy of the statement adopted by our Board on January 15, 1934, in which you will find this Basis of Union quoted on page 5, with Dr. Charles Hodge's comment on page 6. It needs to be clearly discerned and declared now, as you laid it down so plainly in your speech at the last General Assembly, that the law of the Church is not at the mercy of every individual's private interpretation but that it is determined by the Courts of the Church. Some of our friends have set up the amazing contention that the Independent Board is free from all jurisdiction of the Church because it says it is. One of the arguments maintains that the Independent Board does not come under Chapter 23 of the Form of Government simply because it disclaims any relationship to the General Assembly, just as though American citizens should set up a private Department of State, claiming that it alone represented the true doctrine and tradition of the nation and should attack the fidelity and the policy and the faithfulness of the Government's Department and then maintain that it was exempt from all liability simply because it disclaimed any relation to Congress. It is not for those who establish an independent agency in the Church to determine what its relationship to the Church is. It is for the proper Courts of the Church to determine this, either in the local congregation or in the Presbytery or in the Synod or in the

bounds of the Church at large. Under the contention that has been set up, any group of individual ministers in a Presbytery could set up a Home Missions Committee in rivalry with the Presbytery's Committee and carry on a propaganda of attack on the Presbytery's Committee and maintain a schismatic movement in the Presbytery and escape any discipline by simply setting up the contention that they disclaimed any relationship to the Presbytery and therefore were beyond its jurisdiction and control.

Perhaps this matter should be put a little more fully.

Regarding the contention that the Independent Board is to be recognized as exempt from Chapter 23 simply because it claims that it is, it is to be said: (1) It is to be noticed that the Independent Board was established as a revolt against the authority of the General Assembly. It was so announced at the time of the General Assembly in Columbus. And it is significant that at that Assembly a certain group of Presbyterians offered themselves to the Assembly for election to the Board of Foreign Missions. The General Assembly rejected the motion to elect them. Whereupon that very group of people to whom the Assembly had refused to entrust the foreign missionary work of the Church organized the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. In its origin, accordingly, this Board was in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and was established not as a withdrawal from the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. but as an insurrection within it. (2) The Charter of the Independent Board clearly indicates that the field of its action is Presbyterian, U. S. A. The Charter declares that its doctrinal basis is to be the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., that it is to support missionaries who propagate the faith of the Confession and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., that it is "to encourage Presbyterian churches and individuals to support this Board." Every member of the Board, according to the Charter, is to pledge himself that he sincerely receives and adopts the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. All the charter members of the Board were members of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. By its own Charter, accordingly, the Independent Board comes under the provision of Chapter 23 which relates to missionary associations formed by members of a particular church or particular churches of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (3) The utterances and functions of the Independent Board indicate clearly that it is in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. It at first sought offices in the Witherspoon Building belonging to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Its publicity and propaganda have consisted almost wholly of attacks on the foreign missionaries, the Board of Foreign Missions and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and in the attempt to persuade churches and individuals in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to discontinue their support of the agencies of the Church. The only foreign missionaries whom the Independent Board has sent have been ministers or members of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and one of them, at least, sought the assent of a Presbytery of the Church to his going. (4) Whether an agency or association composed of members of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is or is not to be regarded as falling within the provisions of Chapter 23 of the Form of Government is for the Courts of the Church and not for its individual members to determine. It is the function of the judicatories of the Church to interpret the Constitution of the Church, and individuals who remain in the Church may not escape the jurisdiction of the Church by simply renouncing its authority.

If it is asked what should be done in the present circumstances, is not the answer given in the first paragraph of the Basis of Union of 1758, as follows:

"When any matter is determined by a major vote, every member shall either actively concur with, or passively submit to, such determination; or, if his conscience permit him to do neither, he shall peaceably withdraw from our communion, without attempting to make any schism; provided always, that this shall be understood to extend only to such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable in doctrine, or Presbyterian government."

February 20, 1935.

This is also the fundamental principle cited by Dr. Hodge in his "Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church," edition 1840, Part II, page 250:

"That in matters of discipline and those things which relate to the peace and good order of our churches, they shall be determined according to the major vote of ministers and elders, with which vote every member shall actively concur or passively acquiesce. But if any member cannot in conscience agree to the determination of the majority, and the synod think themselves obliged to insist upon it as essentially necessary to the well-being of our churches, in such case, such dissenting member promises peaceably to withdraw from the body, without endeavouring to raise any dispute or contention upon the debated point, or any unjust alienation from them."

It is well to recall Dr. Charles Hodge's comment on the 1758 Basis of Union:

"Those who adhere to the principles here laid down, are entitled to a standing in the Church; those who desert them, desert not merely the faith but the religion of our fathers, and have no right to their names or their heritage."

You will observe that this fundamental principle includes the right of the judicatories of the Church to determine what matters are "indispensable in doctrine or Presbyterian government." In other words, we are a constitutional Church and not a lawless body of individuals who can assert for themselves the rights and authorities of the Courts of the Church.

Dr. Hodge sets this forth with firmness and clarity:

"When men live under a constitution," he says, page 194, "either in church or state, they are bound to abide by it, and to seek redress only in accordance with its provisions. It is obvious that no society, civil or ecclesiastical, can long exist, whose members assume the prerogative of redressing their own grievances. In this country, more than in most others, it is important that the great duty of abiding by the law, should be graven on the hearts of the people."

And again, page 251, Dr. Hodge holds that:

"The great schism was not the result of conflicting views, either as to doctrine or church government. It was the result of alienation of feeling." In this alienation men "denounced brethren, whose Christian character they had no right to question."

We should learn from those times "that violence is no proper remedy for disorder, and that adherence to the constitution, is not only the most Christian, but also the most effectual means of resistance against the disturbers of the peace and order of the church."

I have written all this just for you personally in response to your question. I judge that the whole issue is a real one in only a very few Presbyteries, probably only in the Presbyteries in which there are members of the Independent Board. One hears almost nothing of the matter elsewhere, and the interesting thing is not that the propaganda of the Independent Board has stirred up so much trouble but rather that it has been so futile and self-destructive.

My own disposition has been to say nothing, to endure the misrepresentations and falsehoods that have been spread abroad and to make no reply. It has seemed to me that this has been the Christian principle. At least this was the way our Lord acted. When He was reviled He reviled not again. But the question how is not a personal question. It is a question of the authority and integrity of the Church and as to whether men are to be free to remain in the Church at the same time that they trample upon its authority and devote themselves to an attempt to render it asunder. It is all the worse because the leaders of this destructive movement have come into the Church from outside and are now attempting to destroy a household which neither they nor their fathers helped to establish.

It is too bad that this spirit of dissension and intolerance has broken out in our Church. It is instructive to see how closely it parallels the situation in the Church which led to the Schism of 1741 brought about by Gilbert Tennent, of whom Dr. Hodge says that "he was so completely the soul of the party to which he belonged, that without him it never would have existed." I wish that you would re-read the whole V. Chapter of the II. volume of Hodge's "Constitutional History" and note the parallels with our present situation. Dr. Hodge's summary of the fundamental cause of the Schism ought to be a warning to all of us, whatever our mind may be:

"The censorious spirit, which so extensively prevailed at this period, was another of those fountains of bitter waters, which destroyed the health and vigor of the church....It was this, more than anything else, that produced that conflagration in which the graces, the peace, and union of the church were consumed.....The evil in question consists in regarding and treating, on insufficient grounds, those who profess to be Christians, as though they were hypocrites....If the fruit of the Spirit of God is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, then may we be sure that a proud, arrogant, denunciatory, self-confident, and self-righteous spirit is not of God; and that any work which claims to be a revival of religion, and is characterized by such a spirit, is so far spurious and fanatical. All attempts to account for or excuse such a temper on the ground of uncommon manifestations, or uncommon hatred of sin, or extraordinary zeal for holiness and the salvation of souls, are but apologies for sin.....The more we know of sin, of our own hearts, and of Jesus Christ, the more shall we be forbearing, forgiving, and lamb-like, in our disposition and conduct." Hodge proceeds to speak also of "The disregard shown to the common rules of ecclesiastical order," that is, making no effort to deal with men according to Church law and order and of denouncing them and trying to break down their influence.

There ought to be room in our Church for Dr. Machen and his group even if many of their convictions are at variance with the true tradition of the Church, as they certainly are. Indeed, it is interesting to see how they avoid citing the authority of men like Dr. Patton and Charles Hodge and Samuel Miller. But there is not room in the Church for men who deny room to everybody but themselves. Within the limits of our Confession there is a just and noble principle of toleration which makes ample room for men like Dr. Machen who with all their errors still have a great contribution to make, such as he has made in books like the "Virgin Birth" and "The Origin of Paul's Religion." But this very nature of this principle of toleration within the Confession is at variance with the spirit of those who will not allow any party but their own. And the case is the more clear when the party in question now claims to be the Bible-Christian party and is nothing of the kind. The saddest feature of the situation is the un-Biblical and the anti-Biblical character of much of the teaching and much of the spirit of this schismatic and divisive group, e. g., as to the Person of Christ and His real Humanity, the nature of the Atonement and of the Church and especially as to

The Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D. D. - 6.

February 20, 1935

eschatology, where the teaching of the Bible is just ignored, the "faith of Christ" and the character of God.

Would that the day might come when we could stand on our Confession, with its attempt to state the truth of the Scriptures, and then its noble declaration that the Scriptures are superior to this attempt and are both open to every Christian and also the sole authority for his faith and practice.

With warm regard -

Your sincere friend,

RES:AMW

Enc.1

October 8, 1935

Dr. Mark A. Matthews,
7th Avenue and Spring Streets,
Seattle, Washington.

My dear Mark:

Perhaps it will be well to supplement what I have quoted in the accompanying letter from Charles Hodge's History of the Presbyterian Church with some further statements bearing specifically on the issue of obedience or disobedience to constitutional authority in our church. In Volume II, page 160, Dr. Hodge writes with regard to the procedure of Tennant and his associates:

"In Scotland, in consequence of the union between the church and the state, it has been found a difficult matter to discipline a Presbytery. In this country such difficulty does not exist. If a Presbytery persist in violating the constitution, it may, in perfect consistency with our principles, be dissolved as was the case with the Cumberland Presbytery; or dissolved, and its members attached to other Presbyteries. But even if there had been no reasonable prospect of success, this would afford no justification of the aggrieved party for taking the law into their own hands. When men live under a constitution, either in church or state, they are bound to abide by it, and to seek redress only in accordance with its provisions. It is obvious that no society, civil or ecclesiastical, can long exist, whose members assume the prerogative of redressing their own grievances. In this country, more than in most others, it is important that the great duty of abiding by the law, should be graven on the hearts of the people."

In Volume II, page 205, Dr. Hodge is dealing with the points of agreement and disagreement between Mr. Tennant's party and Mr. Thompson. He says:

"They both held that the decisions and rules of church judicatories were binding on dissentient members, provided those determinations were not regarded as sinful. And further, they agreed, that when the conscience of any member forbade compliance with such determinations, his duty was peaceably to withdraw, and not trample on the rules of the body."

He quotes Mr. Thompson as saying:

"The minority of a church judicatory do virtually promise to be determined by the suffrage of the majority, every time they consent to let the matter in debate go to a vote; and, therefore, afterwards to refuse objection to such determination is to forfeit their promise."

He quoted the authors of A Protest which he is citing as declaring:

"If we cannot agree without voting, the majority have a casting vote in all our determinations, as is usual in all judicatories civil and ecclesiastical, so that the minority or dissenting voters, in rules of common concern, must either comply, or forbear to counteract, or separate."

Hodge says that Mr. Tennant himself teaches the same doctrine:

"No doubt a smaller number," says he, "ought freely to submit to the conclusions of the majority, in matters of government, which they, the majority, judge essential to the well-being of the church. For without this there could be no government at all. Without this the minor party would have power to impose upon the major, in things which they reckon of the last consequence to the good of the society; which is absurd. It is true the major party may be mistaken as well as the minor, and consequently abuse their power, for which there is no help in the present imperfect state of things, but humble remonstrance by reason and argument. Yet considered as a society, the majority have a right to judge for themselves, (upon the plan of private judgment,) what they reckon essential to their constitution, or to the well-being of the church under their care, and consequently to exclude from their society such as do not comply therewith."

In this same discussion he quotes the basis of the formation of the Synod to which the Presbytery of New Brunswick, to which Tennant and his party belonged, attached itself, as declaring as one of its fundamental principles:

"That in matters of discipline and those things which relate to the peace and good order of our churches, they shall be determined according to the major vote of ministers and elders, with which vote every member shall actively concur or passively acquiesce. But if any member cannot in conscience agree to the determination of the majority, and the Synod think themselves obliged to insist upon it as essentially necessary to the well-being of our churches, in such case, such dissenting member promises peaceably to withdraw from the body, without endeavouring to raise any dispute or contention upon the debated point, or any unjust alienation from them."

Dr. Hodge himself in commenting on these various statements of the different parties says:

"They were agreed in the right of Synods to set down rules for the government of the church. They were agreed in the binding authority of these rules even over dissentients, except when such dissentients believed them to be sinful. They were agreed that when a member could not obey a given rule with a good conscience, it was his duty peaceably to withdraw. Finally, they were agreed that when a Synod saw that the minority were opposed to any measure, not in judgment only, but in conscience, they ought not to insist upon it, and thus necessitate a schism, unless they believed the measure to be essential to the well-being of the churches. These principles are all so plain and so reasonable, that we need not wonder they commanded the unanimous consent of both parties, or that they have remained the unquestioned principles of our church from that day to this."

Dr. Hodge closes this chapter in his history with the statement:

"It appears from this history that the great schism was not the result of conflicting views, either as to doctrine or church government. It was the result of alienation of feeling produced by the controversies relating to the revival. In these controversies the New Brunswick brethren were certainly the aggressors. In their unrestrained zeal, they denounced brethren, whose Christian character they had no right to question. They disregarded the usual rules of ministerial intercourse, and avowed the principle that in extraordinary times and circumstances such rules ought to be suspended. Acting upon this principle, they divided the great majority of the congregations within the sphere of their operations, and by appealing to the people, succeeded in overwhelming their

"brethren with popular obloquy. Excited by a sense of injury, and alarmed by the disorders consequent on these new methods, the opposite party had recourse to violent measures for redress, which removed none of the evils under which they suffered, and involved them in a controversy with a large class of their brethren, with whom they had hitherto acted in concert. These facts our fathers have left on record for the instruction of their children; to teach them that in times of excitement the rules of order, instead of being suspended, are of more importance than ever to the well-being of the church; that no pretence of zeal can authorize the violation of the rules of charity and justice; and on the other hand, that it is better to suffer wrong than to have recourse to illegal methods of redress; that violence is no proper remedy for disorder, and that adherence to the constitution is not only the most Christian, but also the most effectual means of resistance against the disturbers of the peace and order of the church."

Later than the two Synods into which the church was divided came together, one of the clear principles insisted upon throughout was:

"That every member promise that, after any question has been determined by the major vote, he will actively concur, or passively submit to the judgment of the body. But if his conscience permit him to do neither of these, that then he shall be obliged peaceably to withdraw from our synodical communion, without any attempt to make a schism or division among us. Yet this is not intended to extend to any cases but those which the Synod judge essential in matters of doctrine or discipline."

"That we all agree to esteem and treat it as a censurable evil to accuse any of our members of error in doctrine, or immorality in conversation, any otherwise than by private reproof, till the accusation has been brought before a regular judicature, and issued according to the known rules of our discipline."

Ever faithfully,

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

September 11, 1946.

Dear Dr. Speer,

This particular group of five sheets was incomplete when I first viewed it at Princeton. I am quite positive that none of it has been lost through any negligence on my part.

Sincerely, Lefferts A. Leetcher.

III

19 a

Thus far the Commission has put emphasis upon the opinions of others and has attempted to present fairly the differences of view which are unsettling the thought of the Church and impairing its spiritual life. The Commission desires now to submit some of its own conclusions with special reference to the best method of approach to the problem before us.

A spiritual revival and a reconsecration of every life to Christ are imperative if harmony is to prevail and our Church is to render full service. Doubtless everyone will assent to this statement. In all our discussions its truth should be assumed as a prime condition of accord. We must begin on our knees, with confession of our sins and with sincere repentance, and must move forward ~~in~~ in the spirit of a renewed allegiance to the Master and of a closer fellowship with Him which will conquer our selfishness and pride and hardness and will insure in us humility of mind and the purity of heart which yields a vision of God.

Following this, our ^{only} safe[^] and ~~most~~ successful method[^] will be found in the field of constitutional processes. Our Church ^{under the guidance of the Holy Spirit} has been bound together by its constitution, and the constitution ^t must keep it together.

to top.

III. Constitutional Principle of Toleration with its Historical Background.

Foremost^s among the forces making for unity is a common faith expressed in our confessional symbols, but intimately related to this, and defining the way in which the faith is to be held among brethren in the Presbyterian Church is the constitutional principle of toleration.

The principle of toleration is as truly a part of our constitution as are any of the doctrines stated in that instrument. Not only is the principle expressed in definite terms, but its place and authority as a feature of our organic law is further certified by its appearance in a number of the articles by clear and necessary implication. Furthermore, it is recognized through unbroken practice in the administration of our form of government and our discipline.

Toleration must be distinguished from the granting of mere liberty of choice in either of two respects. In the first place, it is not a recognition of the liberty of withdrawing from our denomination. This is a right which inheres in membership in any voluntary association. If the Presbyterian Church permitted no difference of opinion on any subject whatever, freedom to withdraw from the church would still exist; and this freedom would not be affected in the least did our Church have no constitution at all. In the second place, toleration, in the sense in which we are now using the term, is not to be identified with conceding to every other religious group or organization the same status that we claim for our own. This latter is a right guaranteed by the constitution of the Nation and by the constitutions of the States and extends to every body of citizens who desire to worship together.

Toleration as a principle applicable within the Presbyterian Church refers to an attitude and a practice according to which the status of a ~~person as a~~ ^{minister} Presbyterian is acknowledged and fellowship is extended to him, even though he may hold some views that are individual and uncommon on points not regarded as of the substance of the faith which the church professes. In some instances such a brother may believe sincerely that he is in full accord with the body of doctrine to which the Church witnesses. In other instances he may be conscious of standing somewhat apart from his brethren in certain respects, but not far enough apart to place him outside the pale of the Church. It requires something besides logic and theological knowledge to make a Presbyterian. Presbyterianism is more than ~~a~~ ^{a great body of belief but it} ~~belief~~; it ^{this}

is a tradition also, a controlling sentiment. The ties which bind us to it are not of the mind only; they are ties of the heart as well. There are people who, despite variant opinions, can never be at home in any other communion. They were born into the Presbyterian Church. They love its name, its order and its great distinctive teachings. In its fellowship they have a precious inheritance from their forbears. Their hearts bow at its altars and cherish a just pride in its noble history. Attitudes and sentiments like these are treasures which should not be undervalued hastily nor cast aside lightly. A sound policy of constitutional toleration is designed to conserve such assets whenever it is possible to do so without endangering the basic positions of the Church.

Of course, the liberty which toleration allows is not to be judged finally by individuals. It is not liberty to run riot in one's thinking or conduct. It is freedom with boundaries, and these boundaries ~~must be~~^{are} fixed by authority. Perhaps we are prone to forget that toleration begins with the mass. It is the self-imposed restraint which an organized body lays upon its own action. Either by a written constitution or by prevailing practice an organization draws lines beyond which it pledges itself not to pass. It delimits areas which it will not invade, and within these areas the individual member of the organization has freedom. The entire body exercises its own liberty first, in voluntary circumscribing the field of its action, and this, in turn, guarantees the liberty of the individual outside of such limits.

It follows therefore, that whenever a question arises as to where these limits are, the issue must be decided by the organization and not by the individual member of it. As applied within the Presbyterian Church, this means that such issues will be determined either generally, by amendment of the constitution, or particularly, by judicial procedure in specific cases, with such limitations as belong to this latter method, some of which are discussed in a later part of this report.

v. 1. 29. / Another constitutional principle which must be recognized and applied in these discussions if they are to prove fruitful, relates to the power

of the General Assembly and the effect of assembly actions. There appears to have been much confusion in the thinking of the Church regarding this subject, and some of the reasons for it are not difficult to trace. As a rule, consideration of the General Assembly's authority has been reserved for periods marked by heated controversy. The atmosphere has not always been favorable either for judicial thinking or temperate expression and for reaching sound and balanced conclusions which would not only serve a special purpose at the time, but also win assent and be accepted as safe precedents afterward.

3. That the General Assembly places the stamp of emphatic disapproval upon any kind of controversy that retards or interferes with the vigorous prosecution of the Church's evangelistic, educational, philanthropic, and missionary work, at home and abroad, or tends to impair the Christian fellowship of the Church by begetting suspicion and distrust; and, therefore, that the Assembly lays upon the consciences of ministers and members, the duty of exercising patience and forbearance, and of refraining from public expression of hasty or harsh judgments of the motives of brethren whose hearts are fully known only to God; especially from bringing against individuals "in a calumniating manner", and not in the legally prescribed way, charges which assail their loyalty as Presbyterian ministers or ruling elders, and even their Christian belief, and otherwise tend to weaken their influence as servants of Christ in His Church; to the end that discussion of the serious problems affecting the welfare of our Church may proceed in a spirit fully worthy of Christian disciplines and calculated to stimulate the Church to greater activity in carrying forward its task.

7-7b India, etc.

Document No. 3

Brief Submitted to the Standing Committee
on Foreign Missions at the General
Assembly in 1933

This brief was a typewritten document consisting of 74 pages which comprised the following documents:

1. An Introductory Statement.
2. An unpublished paper entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support Our Foreign Board?," dated April 1929, written by Dr. J. Gresham Machen. This document was sent by Dr. Machen to Mr. Speer prior to its proposed publication. Mr. Speer answered it at length ~~and~~ ^{but} it was never published.
3. Mr. Speer's reply to this paper of Dr. Machen's, dated April 30, 1929.
4. A reply to Dr. Machen's pamphlet entitled "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions."
5. A letter from the Rev. George T. Scott, a Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, to the Rev. Robert R. Littell, D.D., a member of the Board and Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Missions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, answering the pamphlet by the Rev. J.C. Monsma, General Secretary of the Reformation Fellowship, entitled "The Foreign Missionary Situation in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."
6. Two letters issued by the Candidate Department of the Board in 1932 and 1933 criticized by Dr. Machen.
7. A reply to Dr. Machen's address at the Presbytery of New Brunswick, April 11, 1933, as reported in "Christianity To-day," Mid-April, 1933.
8. A statement presented by Mr. Speer to the Presbytery of New Brunswick at its meeting on April 11, 1933, with regard to the Overture presented by Dr. Machen at that meeting and rejected by the Presbytery.

It would be expensive to publish this entire brief and it may perhaps suffice to make available at the present time only sections 4, and 7, as listed above, which are presented herewith. If it should prove necessary later the entire brief can be made available.

Answer to Dr. Machen and Mr. Monsma

The General Assembly will have before it several overtures relating to the Board of Foreign Missions. Some of them express the confidence of the Presbyteries in the Board and others distrust. Of the latter, two are now known, one from the Presbytery of Northumberland and the other from the Presbytery of Philadelphia. The latter was first presented by the author, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, to his own Presbytery, the Presbytery of New Brunswick and was decisively defeated by that Presbytery. Later it was adopted by the Philadelphia Presbytery, which, however, at its earlier meeting on April 3rd, had adopted the following statement:

Approved Report of Special
Committee on Foreign Missions.

"Your Committee on Foreign Missions has given prayerful and careful consideration to the criticisms of our Board of Foreign Missions offered by the Rev. John Clover Monsma, the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, and others. These gentlemen were invited to meet with the Committee and were given unlimited time to present their views. At the request of the Committee, Messrs. Monsma and Griffiths furnished written statements of their position, hereto attached. A revised form of that of Mr. Monsma has been printed and furnished to members of the Presbytery.

"In addition your Committee had before it a written reply of a representative of the Board of Foreign Missions to the criticisms, and also listened to the personal statements of Dr. Robert Littell and Dr. Cheesman Herrick, members of the Board of Foreign Missions. We also considered the "Action of the Board of Foreign Missions regarding the Report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry", Dr. Speer's survey of the Laymen's Inquiry under the Title of "Re-Thinking Missions Examined", and other papers bearing on the situation.

"We would especially commend the straight-forward evangelical loyalty of the Board as expressed in its "Action regarding the Report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Missions Inquiry", issued under date of November 21, 1932; particularly the following statement:

"The Board affirms its abiding loyalty to the evangelical basis of the missionary enterprise. The work of the Board is built on the motive described in the foreword of the Commission's Report in the words, 'to some of our members the enduring motive of Christian missions can only be adequately expressed as loyalty to Jesus Christ regarded as the perfect revelation of God and the only way by which men can reach a satisfying experience of Him.' The Board adheres to the aim and ideal of missionary work and to the conception of the Gospel embodied in the New Testament and in the historic witness of the Church and will continue its work on this basis, regarding Jesus Christ as the only Lord and Saviour and seeking to make Him known as the Divine Redeemer of individuals and of society. The Board has long expressed and still expresses this aim in its Manual as follows:

"The supreme and controlling aim of Foreign Missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian Churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen, and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

"We commend most heartily and enthusiastically Dr. Robert E. Speer for his masterly presentation of our Church's position in his "Re-Thinking Missions Examined", and we would here record our utmost confidence in his fine loyalty to our Lord and His great commission as evidenced through the years of his splendid service to the Church.

"Opinions were freely expressed by the brethren presenting the criticisms but in the judgment of your Committee sufficient proof was not offered relating to specific cases as to justify us in sustaining the criticisms.

"We recommend that no action be taken on the overture to the General Assembly proposed by Mr. Monsma; we offer the following Resolution to be transmitted to the Board of Foreign Missions:

"WHEREAS, Pearl S. Buck, a missionary under appointment by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has written various articles, reviews, and letters, which are clearly at variance with the declared aims and policies of the said Church and Board, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Presbytery of Philadelphia requests the Board of Foreign Missions to ask the resignation of Mrs. Pearl S. Buck as a missionary under its care; and that it further requests the Board of Foreign Missions not to publish, advertise or distribute the mission study books for children prepared by Pearl S. Buck, as authorized by the Board."

Attest. _____

I. Sturjer Shultz

Stated Clerk

Presbytery of Philadelphia."

The overture of Dr. Machen, which this Presbytery subsequently adopted and the overture of the Northumberland Presbytery cover substantially the same ground, and an answer to the former will deal with the full substance of the latter.

This present statement is designed, then, to deal with Dr. Machen's overture. This overture has been supported by a pamphlet by Dr. Machen entitled "Modernism and The Board of Foreign Missions in the U.S.A." and by the address of Dr. Machen in presenting his overture to the Presbytery of New Brunswick on April 11, 1933. A more detailed overture of the same general character had been presented to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, by the Rev. J.C. Monsma, then General Secretary of the Reformation Fellowship, but later "dismissed" (See "Christianity Today", mid-April 1933, last page), and was rejected by the Presbytery of Philadelphia and answered in its action of April 3rd. . Mr. Monsma issued a pamphlet in support of this overture which covers some of the same ground and is of the same general nature as Dr. Machen's pamphlet. It would seem wise, accordingly, to attempt to deal in essential matters with all these four documents, namely,

(1) Dr. Machen's overture adopted by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, (2) his pamphlet, (3) his address at the New Brunswick Presbytery as reported in "Christianity Today", Mid-April, Volume III, No. 12, and (4) Mr. Monsma's pamphlet, "The Foreign Mission Seduction in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

It is a mistake to suppose, however, that Dr. Machen's attitude is due to the arguments set forth in his pamphlet and address or is likely to be modified by any answers to these arguments. For some years, and antedecedent to most of his present allegations, he has felt and expressed his distrust, and opposition to the Foreign Board.

In 1926 he declared his opposition both to the Board of National Missions and to the Board of Foreign Missions. In the spring of 1929 he prepared a paper entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board," and sent this to me for examination and criticism. I wrote to him very fully with regard to this paper. He was not convinced by my reply but the paper was not published. I have no permission to publish it now but I am free to publish my reply as covering the objections which he made then and some of which are repeated in his latest pamphlet. My answer is found in this present pamphlet as Chapter I.

Chapter II is a reply to Dr. Machen's pamphlet, "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."

Chapter III is a letter from my associate, Dr. Scott, to Dr. Littell, of the Tioga Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, who is a member of the Board, in comment on Mr. Monsma's statement as presented to the Presbytery of Philadelphia in November 1932, which was considerably toned and modified in the printed form in which it was later distributed.

Chapter IV is a reply to Dr. Machen's address at the Presbytery of New Brunswick as reported in "Christianity Today", and remembered by those who heard it.

Chapter V is the statement which I made, at its request, to the Presbytery of New Brunswick at its meeting on April 11, dealing with the specific proposals of the overture presented by Dr. Machen.

CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

An Inquiry Presented for the Consideration
of the Evangelical Members
of the
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By

J. Gresham Machen

April 1929

Every agency appealing for funds should be willing to give an account of its stewardship to those to whom it appeals. This principle applies to the Board of Foreign Missions of our Presbyterian Church. The Board is supported not by a tax levied on the members of the Church, but by voluntary contributions. If contributors think that their gifts are being devoted by the Board to the ends for the sake of which they have contributed them, then they will continue their support; otherwise they cannot reasonably be expected to do so.

There are some contributors who need have no hesitation about continuing their support of the Board. These are the contributors that are interested in the social or material or educational aspects of the Board's work. It is perfectly clear that our Foreign Board is performing a valuable humanitarian service in many parts of the world, and those who want to contribute to such a humanitarian service may probably have confidence in this particular agency. But there are other contributors who may well have grave doubts as to whether they are justified in continuing their gifts. These are the contributors who are interested in propagating the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God. Can these Bible-loving and Bible-believing Christians conscientiously continue their support of our Foreign Board?

Obviously the question cannot possibly be answered by pronouncements of the General Assembly; for the distrust which evangelical Christians have with respect to the Board itself applies in equal measure to the Assembly. When, indeed, the issue between the Bible and modern belief is clearly presented, the Assembly usually stands on the side of the Bible; ⁽¹⁾ repeated pronouncements have affirmed that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of our Lord, are essential doctrines of our Faith ⁽²⁾. But these pronouncements have been made, practically speaking, a dead letter by the fact that the machinery of the Church is almost altogether in the hands of those who are concealing the real gravity of the situation that exists. Evasive reports as to the state of the Church, like that of the Commission of Fifteen of 1925-1927, will hardly restore the confidence of evangelical Christians; on the contrary, they will in the end do more to destroy confidence than any open presentation of the facts could possibly do. If, therefore, the Foreign Board is to regain the lost confidence of evangelical Christians in the Church, it cannot do so by any appeal to ecclesiastical

(1) The assembly stood on the side of the Bible in the "Gantz case" in 1925. In 1927, in the judicial case concerning the licensure of candidates in the Presbytery of New York, it stood against the Bible and in favor of modern unbelief, but only because of the fact that the Moderator, Dr. Speer, quite illegally permitted the representatives of the Synod of New York, who were parties in interest, to vote in the case.

(2) See the pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1910 confirmed by that of 1923 (Minutes, 1923, p. 253).

committees, but can only do so by meeting squarely the objections of individual givers. These individual givers must still raise the question: "Can evangelical Christians conscientiously contribute to our Foreign Board?"

I shall not now attempt to answer that question in any comprehensive way; I shall not attempt any comprehensive examination of the work which the Board is carrying on in foreign lands; but shall merely refer to certain disquieting facts which have come under my immediate observation. Those disquieting facts concern, first, the treatment of candidates for the mission field and, second, the pronouncements of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

I.

With regard to the former subject, my position as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary has given me rather unusual opportunities for observation. I have been thrown into close spiritual contact with a large body of young men who graduate from our seminary from year to year. These young men, of course, differ widely as to the clearness with which they have received into their minds and hearts the gospel of the Cross of Christ; and, in particular, they differ widely in the degree of bravery with which they are resolved to proclaim that gospel in the presence of the unbelief now rampant in the Church. But the large majority of them - indeed a proportion truly amazing in view of the hostile forces now abroad in the world - have resolved to stand firmly for that gospel of the Cross, and firmly against the current indifferentism and unbelief.

Some of these men have cherished as the ambition of their lives the thought of going to the foreign mission field. At last the time approaches for the realization of their high resolve. They meet in conference with representatives of our Board of Foreign Missions. What impression is made by these conferences upon their minds? Are these young men commended for the clearness with which they recognize the insufficiency of all other ways of salvation save the Cross of Christ considered as a substitutionary death for our sins; are they warned against the deadly peril of making common cause with those who preach the "other gospel" of agnostic Modernism; are they encouraged to trust, not in ecclesiastical combinations of human influences, but simply and solely in the Spirit of God making use of the blessed gospel that the Scriptures contain; are they commended for their understanding of the distinctness of our Reformed Faith over against various subtractions from the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God; are they confirmed in their sense of the high liberty of the Presbyterian minister whether at home or abroad? I can certainly, to say the least, find no clear evidence that such is the case. On the contrary, these young men, so far as I can judge by the spiritual effect on them, are given the impression that they are expected to conform to the policy of church cooperation and union which the representatives of the Board favor, and that not separation from the non-Christian world, whether within or without the visible Church, but cooperation with those who differ from us is the crying need of the hour.

My impression with regard to this matter is strengthened by the

official "Candidate Reference Blank" which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries. The reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others", "desire to progress in spiritual truth," "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions on this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ as it is set forth in Holy Scripture, and whether he himself is clear in his understanding of the great issue between supernaturalism and naturalism, between evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the Church. There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Such a questionnaire, because of the choice of leading questions, creates very plainly the impression that "tolerance of opposing views" is far more valued by the Foreign Board than loyalty to the whole Word of God.

The same impression is also created by the "Application Form" which the candidates themselves are asked to fill out. That form contains the following question "Section I, question 17):

Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions?

It is difficult to see how any Christian man, certainly how any Protestant, can possibly answer such a question in the affirmative. The Rev. Lindsay S.B. Hadley, indeed, the Candidate Secretary of the Board, in his letter to me of March 8, 1928, distinguishes between "opinions" and "convictions":

This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout.

But in making this distinction between opinions and convictions, Mr. Hadley seems to differ sharply from the Form of Government of our Church, where in Chapter I, Section iv, it is said:

And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are (italics mine).

Here the word "opinion" seems clearly to be used in the sense in which Mr. Hadley uses the word "conviction". And surely, in this difference, the Form of Government and not Mr. Hadley is right. The man who does not share a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as an "opinion"; the man who does share it is inclined to regard it as a "conviction". "Opinion" and "conviction", therefore, from the point of view with which we are now concerned, are practically speaking synonymous terms. I still do not see, therefore, how any evangelical Christian, in this day of widespread defection from the faith, can possibly answer in the affirmative the question in the Application Form.

This impression is deepened by an examination of Section IV in the Application Form, which deals with "Religious Experience". That section is declared by the Candidate Secretary in the letter to which reference has already been made, to be "very definite". The secretary writes as follows:

This question (question 17 of Section I) as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 5 under "Religious Experience", which, as you will see are very definite (italics mine).

Let us now turn to those statements which Mr. Hadley declared to be "very definite". The only questions in the section which can by any chance be referred to are questions 5, 5, 6. The last two of these read as follows:

5. Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord, and Master?
6. Is it your purpose to make _____ as your chief aim of your missionary career, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?

Are these the questions which Mr. Hadley regards as "very definite"? Surely the adjective as applied to them is strangely misplaced; for the questions are utterly vague. All the terms used - "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" - are used today in such widely diverse senses that the questions could be answered in the affirmative by men who from the point of view of the Bible and of evangelical Christians are unbelievers of a very thoroughgoing kind. That the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Missions should speak of such studiously vague language as being "very definite" raises in very insistent fashion the question whether evangelical Christians can possibly continue to contribute to such a Board.

This question becomes still more insistent when we examine the remaining one of the three questions to which reference has just been made.

#5.

That question is question 3. It reads as follows:

3. Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?

This question must surely be taken in connection with question 17 of Section I which has been quoted above. The candidate must have no views that prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, and he must be willing to submit his opinion to the majority vote of any group of such missionaries to which he may belong. It is surely a large promise; and we ought to consider carefully what it may involve. What may those "opinions" be which the candidate must, on occasion, be allowed to override his own?

The impression has certainly been made upon some candidates that among the opinions which he is required to allow to over-ride his own are opinions like those which led to the formation of the United Church of Canada; the impression has clearly been made that former service in the Presbyterian Church of Canada (called by its enemies the "Continuing Presbyterian Church") is to be regarded as a ground of suspicion when a candidate comes before the representatives of our Board. Mr. Hadley says that that is not the case; yet in view of his correspondence with me I cannot see how any other impression could possibly have been produced. The whole impression is that the candidate must be ready on occasion to give up the Faith of our Church in accordance with a majority vote, as though he were merely changing a suit of clothes.

At any rate there is one set of "opinions" with which a missionary in these days can hardly avoid contact. It is the kind of opinion represented by the "Auburn Affirmation", which declares in perfectly plain language that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are non-essential even for the ministers in our Church. The Affirmation has been signed by about thirteen hundred of our ministers, and unquestionably the point of view that it represents is shared by very large numbers of ministers who did not sign it. What guarantee has the candidate that such opinions are not represented on our mission field, and that it is not to such opinions that he is being asked by question 17 to be willing to submit his own?

But it is not merely such general disquietude that suggests itself in this connection. For it is a fact - a fact which will come as a surprise and shock to many evangelical Christians throughout the Church, but still a fact all the same - that Mr. Hadley, the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Board, is himself a signer of the Affirmation. This Secretary, who fills this peculiarly important position, who stands in this peculiarly intimate relation to the men who desire to devote themselves to foreign mission work, is a signer of a formal statement that is hostile not only to evangelical Christianity but to all Christianity at its very root.

The cancer of the Auburn Affirmation and what it represents, moreover, cuts far deeper into our Foreign Board than merely by the presence of an

Affirmationist in the position of Candidate Secretary. No less than four among the fifteen ministerial members of the Board are signers of this notable anti-evangelical pronouncement. And what, in this situation, is the attitude of the staff, as distinguished from the governing members, of the Board? Dr. Robert E. Speer, surely, is qualified to give the answer. His answer is given in a letter which he sent to me, jointly with Dr. John A. Marquis of the Board of National Missions, on May 6, 1926:

First - all the members of the Board of the Church were elected by the General Assembly. The Assembly clearly believed that they were loyal and faithful ministers and members of the Church. We know of not one who does not accept the Constitution and Standards of the Church and who is not truly and loyally evangelical.

At the time when that letter was written, no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the Foreign Board were signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Yet all these gentlemen are regarded as "truly and loyally evangelical" by Dr. Marquis and Dr. Speer! What possible confidence can really consistent evangelical Christians have in Boards whose standards of what is truly and loyally evangelical are such as this? What kind of mission work is it in which the full truthfulness of Holy Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are, all and severally, regarded as non-essential? Certainly it is a kind of mission work which no consistent evangelical Christian can support.

Is it such questions with regard to which candidates for the mission field are required to show "tolerance of the point of view of others"? The whole tendency, the whole attitude of the Candidate Department strongly creates such an impression. The question is not whether men ^{who} are lukewarm in their testimony against Modernism will be sent to the foreign field, but whether men who are faithful in their testimony, will be sent. One thing at least is clear: No real evangelical Christian, certainly no intelligent one, can possibly, without disloyalty to his Saviour and Lord, contribute to any mission work that is favorable to the point of view represented by the Auburn Affirmation. The Affirmation is hostile to repeated pronouncements of the General Assembly. But that is not the serious objection to it. The really serious objection to it is that it is hostile to the Word of God.

II.

A second cause of disquiet regarding the Foreign Board is found in the utterances of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

Among those utterances, one deserves special attention. It is the booklet, "Are Foreign Missions Done For?" which Dr. Speer has recently dis-

tributed widely in the Church. "This little book", says the preface, "is an attempt to meet fairly and honestly some of the present day questions which are raised with regard to the foreign missionary enterprise." The booklet has been widely distributed, and evidently it is intended by its author to be an apologia for the work of our Foreign Board. Here then, if anywhere, the evangelical Christian might fairly expect to obtain some sort of answer to the questions which he has felt obliged to raise.

Are such expectations satisfied? We are obliged to say very plainly that they are not. Far from setting forth any clearly evangelical position on the great specific questions that agitate the Church, Dr. Speer's book from beginning to end is dishearteningly evasive and vague.

This vagueness appears in most distressing form just when the author seems to suppose that what he says is particularly clear. No less than twice in the course of the book Dr. Speer quotes an utterance made by a conference held at Princeton in 1920 (1). That utterance, he says has "nothing uncertain or confused" about it; "it is definite and comprehensive" (p. 56). The evangelical reader will naturally turn with high hopes to an utterance for which such claims are advanced. Surely, he will say, the utterance must set forth in no uncertain terms the authority of the written Word as over against the current mysticism that turns rather to Christian experience or Christ in the soul; surely it must declare the absolute necessity, for every missionary, of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

Are such hopes realized? What is this evangelical utterance which Dr. Speer declares to be so comprehensive and so plain? The evangelical Christian may have difficulty in believing his eyes when he finds that the following is all that it is:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

(1) Pp. 56, 81. In one other place, also, a practically identical declaration is quoted. (p. 64).

Such is the utterance which is declared to be so definite and so clear! No doubt it will seem clear to the agnostic Modernism that is rampant in our Church; for it is couched in just the vague, ambiguous language that Modernism loves. All the terms - "Lord", "Divine Saviour", "disciples", and, alas, "Jesus Christ" - are used today in senses entirely alien to the Word of God; and the utterance ignores altogether the grand particularities of the Christian faith. The utterance speaks of "the spirit and principles of Christ"; but "spirit" is spelled with a small letter and the Third Person of the blessed Trinity is ignored; the utterance speaks of Jesus as Saviour, but there is nothing about the sin from which He saves or the Cross by which salvation was wrought; the utterance speaks of bringing to bear upon human life "the spirit and principles of Christ", but there is nothing about the necessity of the mysterious, regenerating work of God's Spirit, without which "the spirit and principles of Christ" (whatever they may be) are quite powerless to save men from wrath to come. In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the precious blood of Christ. Yet Dr. Speer says (p.81): "No better answer can be given to those who wish to know what our foreign missionaries conceive that they are about and how they are setting about it than to quote the more important of the Findings of this Conference".⁽¹⁾ We can only say that if this be the answer which our Foreign Board has to give regarding the content of the Christian message, then it is difficult to see how evangelical Christians can continue their support of the Board. So far as this declaration indicates, the Board may be propagating the vague "other gospel" of non-doctrinal Modernism just as probably as the blessed gospel that the Bible contains.

The vagueness that characterizes this utterance also characterizes the whole booklet of Dr. Speer. There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all), no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ.⁽²⁾ What sort of gospel is it from which all that makes a gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away, but so is the glory and the power.

Some of the testimonies to which he appeals seem to us, indeed, very unconvincing. There are the testimonies of non-Christian men in mission countries - testimonies to the "moral and spiritual values" of Christianity, to the loftiness of Jesus' teaching and example, to the transforming power of his "principles." Sadness comes over us as we read Dr. Speer's rehearsal of such testimonies. Would they ever have been rendered if missionaries had been faithful in preaching the real Christ? The plain fact is that the real Christ advanced stupendous claims. Unless those claims are true, He is not a perfect

(1) Then follows (pp.81-85) the paragraph quoted above and a fuller transcript of the findings of the Conference, which, however, does not really go beyond this paragraph so far as questions of principles are concerned.

(2) There is one bare mention of "the Crucified and ever Living Lord". (p.37).

ideal at all. He uttered a "hard saying"; and many of His former followers went back and walked no more with Him. Has that hard saying been kept in the background today, that Jesus might win this superficial and patronizing favor among those who have not been born again? Could that favor ever have been won if missionaries had put Calvary in its proper place, if they had been willing to bear the offense of the Cross? Such questions do arise in our minds when we read Dr. Speer's enthusiastic words about the permeation of the nations with Christian principles and the Christian "spirit".

We do not, indeed, undervalue a good testimony to Christian living by those who are without. How often in recent years has such testimony been wrung from unwilling lips by those who amid the fires of persecution have been true to Jesus Christ! Still, the message of the Cross, when it is faithfully presented, is a very offensive thing. It is to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. When the offense of it is avoided, we are inclined to doubt the faithfulness of the preaching. God grant that the Church, both at home and abroad, may never be ashamed of the offense of the Cross!

But if we differ from Dr. Speer in the arguments by which we defend foreign missions, we agree with him with all our souls in the conclusion. We agree with him in holding that foreign missions are the only hope of the world. Indeed far more poignant is our sense of the need of foreign missions than is his. For we do not share his favorable view of human nature (1); the primary fact, we hold, is that mankind everywhere is lost in sin. We cannot keep that really profound need of the world. How great then is the obligation to preach the one message that will save lost sinners and bring them into peace with God!

But where is that message to be found? Where are missionaries to find the message that they shall proclaim throughout the world? That is surely a basic question. Yet no clear answer to it can be found in Dr. Speer's book -- certainly not the true answer. Dr. Speer speaks of "the search for the infinite riches of God in Christ" (p.37), "a quest for an ever enlarging understanding of the fulness of Christ" (ibid.); but nowhere does he speak of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the true source of the missionary message. He hopes for "some exposure of treasures in Christ or in the New Testament or in the Holy Spirit which have been hidden as yet". (p.46) We cannot help feeling that the Bible is here removed from the unique place in which it is put -- and rightly put -- in the standards of our Church. New exposures of truth, Dr. Speer says, are to be expected from Christ or from the New Testament or from the Holy Spirit. What boundless confusion is

(1) "What is needed", Dr. Speer says, (p.41), "is that everywhere in all lands men should be set free from what is evil and bad and that human good should be built by God's help through Christ and His Gospel." What a difference there is between this teaching and Jesus' words to Nicodemus! "To be born again"! Compare the beginning of Dr. Speer's book, "The Unfinished Task of Foreign Missions (1926), where, on pp. 10f., the use of human goodness - illustrated by Jerome K. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back" - is represented as being the method of Jesus!

is here, what woeful lack of clearness as to the very foundation of all missionary work: (1)

What is the missionary to say when he begins work on his field? Is he to appeal to a Christ in his own soul, is he to draw from his own experience for the content of his message, is he to place the treasures which he finds in the New Testament alongside of other treasures which he finds in Christ or in the Holy Spirit? If he does so, he has deserted the basis upon which all the teaching of our Church rests -- namely, the authority of the blessed written Word of God.

Very different should be the attitude of the true missionary of the Cross. His function is a humbler function, and yet a function which in its humility may prove to be the most glorious function of all. His function is not to draw upon mystical experience of his own for the content of his message, but simply to set forth what is taught in God's Word -- both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, both in the words of Jesus in the Gospels and in the words of the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of Paul. The function of the true missionary is simply to open the pages of the Holy Book and say: "Thus saith the Lord."

He cannot, indeed, do that with any power unless he has received the message in his own heart, unless he knows in his own soul the living Saviour whom the Scriptures present. The Holy Spirit must illumine for him the sacred page. But the content of his message will be based upon the Bible and upon the Bible alone.

When the message is based upon the Bible alone, the content of the message will be very different from that which now is heard. Gone will be all vagueness like the vagueness of Dr. Speer's little book. Instead, there will stand out the great verities which the Church is commissioned to set forth -- the awful holiness of God, the deadly guilt and power of sin, the true deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His mighty miracles, His obedience to the law, His righteousness with which believers are clothed, His sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, His glorious resurrection in the body in which he suffered, His ascension into Heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the utter powerlessness of man, the sovereign grace of God by which alone are made alive those who were dead in trespasses and sins, the new and right relation to God received only by those in whom the Holy Spirit has wrought faith, the new walk and conversation of those who have been received by God and made alive from the dead, the dread yet glorious hope of Christ's supernatural appearing in glory when He shall come to judge

(1) Compare Dr. Speer's book "The New Opportunity of the Church", 1919, p. 44: "Deeper and more religious meanings than we have ever proclaimed are discerned in the Cross of Christ, revealed and illustrated in the war." Does Dr. Speer mean that these new "meanings" are deeper and more religious than those that are set forth in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians or in the eighth chapter of Romans? And have these Scriptural "meanings" never been proclaimed from New Testament times until the World War? Ah, how far are we here from the majestic simplicity of the gospel of the Cross!

the world.

A new and glorious day will it be for the distracted Church when that message again shall ring out clear, when there shall be a return from the imaginations of men's hearts to God's Holy Word. Meanwhile there are those who already love and honor that Word. What shall they do in the present day? Can they continue to support a mission agency that has wandered so far? There are many men and women in our Church who are raising that question. And they will raise it yet more earnestly if they read Dr. Speer's little book with care.

CONCLUSION

should

What, then, evangelical Christians now do? Can they conscientiously continue their contributions to such a Board?

The question might seem to have been answered by what has already been said. But the answer is not really quite so simple as it seems. We ought never to forget that despite the attitude of the Board there are many faithful missionaries under the Board who are proclaiming the full gospel as it is set forth in the whole Word of God. Those faithful missionaries of the Cross should not be allowed to suffer because of the faults of the administrative agency under which they stand. Until some truly evangelical agency is formed to care for those faithful missionaries, evangelical people cannot withhold their support of the present Board.

But has the time not come for the establishment of a truly evangelical missionary agency in the Presbyterian Church -- an agency to which evangelical Christians can contribute, not with hesitation and distrust, but with all confidence and joy, an agency which shall keep clear of entangling alliances and shall proclaim the full glories of the Reformed Faith as they are found in the Word of God? The question may well be raised; it may well be commended to the prayerful consideration of that large body of Christian laymen in our Church who love their Bibles and the crucified Saviour set forth therein, who know that the "principles of Jesus" will never save the world -- nor what Dr. Speer calls his "redeeming life" ⁽¹⁾ -- but only His precious redeeming blood, who are not seeking the patronizing testimony of non-Christian men, which Dr. Speer rehearses at such length, but who are willing to bear the offense of the Cross.

If such an evangelical agency is formed, its virtue must be not merely negative but positive; it must not only avoid denying the gospel, but it must preach the gospel in all its fullness and in all its power. One fundamental vice underlies the defense of the present Board; its representatives seem to think that the burden of proof is to be placed upon those who deny that the Board is sounding an evangelical note. "Be definite in your charges", they say in effect; "point out individual missionaries against whom charges of

(1) The relation of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise to the World Situation of Today," in Christian Students and World Problems, 1924, p. 139.

hereby can be preferred, or else keep silent with your criticism and continue your support." What is the trouble with such a line of defense? Is it not that the defense is negative merely? The assumption seems to be that if the missionaries or the secretaries of the Board cannot be proved to be saying that which is contrary to the gospel of Christ, then all is well. But cannot these gentlemen really understand any better than that the point of view of evangelical Christians in our Church? Cannot they understand that what evangelical Christians demand is not an agency that avoids denying the gospel of the Cross of Christ, that perhaps pays perfunctory lip service to it on explicit demand, but an agency that is on fire with that gospel, that never for one moment keeps it in the background, that preaches it in season and out of season, that combats what is contradictory to it, that presents it as the only way of salvation for lost and dying men? If in answer to the present paper Dr. Speer should affirm his belief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have been able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away -- if he should affirm his belief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn Affirmationists have done despite, if even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs, still our objections would not really be removed. What we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -- not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not, we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with His own precious blood. See ye to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gospel than the gospel of the Cross. And may God show us how we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world!

C O P Y

April 30, 1929

Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D.
Box A., Princeton
New Jersey.

My dear Dr. Machen:

I have already acknowledged the receipt of your letter of April 12th, 1929, with your accompanying paper entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" which you asked me to examine and criticize in order that if it contained anything "untrue or unjust" you might correct it. You courteously added that you would be grateful for any assistance that I might render to this end. I am very glad to respond and to try to help you to an affirmative answer to the question in your paper. I believe that my own Christian convictions are not less evangelical than yours, and I believe that our foreign missionary work and workers are also truly evangelical. If I were not convinced of both of these things I should not be associated with our Foreign Board or with the Presbyterian Church. And I use the word evangelical, as will appear, in its plain and honest sense of fidelity to the full Scriptural warrant and content of the Gospel.

I will try first to indicate particular points in your paper which appear to me to be "untrue or unjust" and then I shall speak of the paper as a whole.

1. Your contrast and implied antagonism between the "humanitarian service" of the Board and "propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God" appears to me to be unjust and untrue and un-Scriptural. It is of course possible to divide the first from the second but not the second from the first. The Gospel includes human service. The New Testament is full of that principle. It insists on such service as one of the evidences and fruits of fidelity to the Gospel. Furthermore, it is by the expression of the Gospel in deeds as well as in words that the Gospel was preached and is ever to be preached. Indeed, in many languages there were no words which had the significance of the English or Greek words embodying the truths of the Gospel and in these languages old words had to be taken and given a new content by life, as the Incarnation and its interpretation did at the beginning. It is true that our Board is carrying on a great body of human service and any one who is desirous of doing such work can not find any better opportunity for it than here, but our Board has always made it perfectly clear that in our policy all philanthropic work is tributary to and associated with the primary aim of evangelization. I have expressed my own convictions on this point again and again. One quotation from "Missionary Principles and Practice" (1902) will suffice: "In all use of philanthropic effort, such as medical missions, relief work, etc., as a method of mission work, the dominant and determining aim must

be evangelistic. Such work is useful as securing friendship, removing prejudice, representing the helpful, unselfish spirit of Christianity, contributing to the preaching of Christ, and the revelation of Him as Saviour and Lord, the source of all life and hope, and as relieving suffering; but it is not the responsibility of the foreign missionary enterprise to care for the sickness and suffering of the world. Times of critical need may occur, as in great famine and pestilence, when a broad liberty of action must be recognized; but in general, the aim of our philanthropic work should be to contribute directly to the preaching of the Gospel, the establishment of the Christian Church, and to the fostering of that Christian spirit which will provide, through the native Church which is growing up and through the people themselves, the salutary fruits of Christianity in philanthropic and humanitarian effort. As a missionary method, philanthropic work should ordinarily be limited, therefore, by the possibility of its evangelistic utilization and influence. A small development of such work contributing powerfully in the direction indicated is better than a large development of but feeble or indirect evangelistic influence." I think it is an error in your paper and in all your books that you do not adequately recognize and set forth the full doctrine of the Scriptures, namely, that the Gospel is to be preached not by word only but also and not less, or less fundamentally, by deeds of love and mercy. And thus preached by word and deed by our Presbyterian Church's Missions true fruitage has followed. Converts have been won and churches have been established as numerous and of as true New Testament character as have resulted from the work of any other missions. You are invited to make any comparison you please, including the undenominational Missions which you have sometimes praised for what you regarded as their superior doctrinal fidelity.

2. It is not for me to presume to defend the General Assembly and the Church at large against your expressions of distrust or your intimations that the Church and the Assembly are not really evangelical. I believe that our Church is evangelical. I wish with you that it were better instructed in the doctrine and more animated by the spirit of the Gospel, but I believe that it is officially and really ~~as~~ truly evangelical Church and I believe, too, that the Foreign Board has not lost its confidence. There are, of course, individuals, like yourself, who feel and express distrust, but I believe you and they are mistaken in this and that the Church is warmly and evangelically loyal both to the Gospel and to the Board and the cause which it represents.

Perhaps I should say a word regarding the footnote referring to the General Assembly in 1927 when, against my reluctance and protest, I was made Moderator. As to my action in connection with Judicial Case No. 1, I erred in unwittingly failing to note and to prevent the voting of members of New York Synod on either side of the question, to the extent to which any of them did vote. These were not, however, the only votes illegally cast. And there were other and graver errors antecedent to these for which I was not responsible and which I could not prevent. For the good and honor of the Church it is better to pass them over, but if this matter is to be brought forward the whole story should be unflinchingly told. I candidly summarized the situation at the meeting of the Assembly the following morning, and the Assembly unanimously sustained my position.

I note your depreciation of the worth of any endorsement of the Foreign Board by the General Assembly but perhaps you would think more kindly of the resolutions of the assembly at Grand Rapids in 1924 adopted on recommendation of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, of which Dr. MacLennan was

Chairman and Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was a member, with regard to union and cooperative enterprises, the selection of missionary candidates, the use of schools and hospitals, and the proclamation of the Gospel which, however, the Committee did not feel bound to describe and define. These were four of the resolutions:

"That while maintaining loyally the policy established by past General Assemblies in repeated enactments with regard to cooperation with other Evangelical bodies in our Foreign Missionary Work the Board be directed to exercise due care with regard to the Evangelical character of all such union and cooperative enterprise, and if there should arise in the work of these enterprises a situation in which teachings unsound or injurious to the Evangelical Faith are given, the Board, as it has declared to be its policy, should either secure the correction of such a situation or failing such withdraw from further participation.

"That the Board be commended for its care in the selection and appointment of candidates for the Foreign Field, and that they be requested to continue to exercise the most scrupulous care in this regard.

"That we rejoice in all the courage in which in home and Church, in hospital and school, by word and by the printed page, Christ has been preached to men, and we assure the Missionaries and native churches of our hope and prayer that the program of simple and direct Evangelism may be so increased that the Gospel may be carried to all the people for whose evangelization we are responsible.

"That in this hour when the world's need of Christ is so manifest and desperate, when the opportunities are so great, and new doors of entrance are opened into lands like Afghanistan, which have been hitherto closed, when young men and women are offering themselves freely for service, when our Missionaries and Churches with which they are uniting are eager for a great advance, when the problems of men and of nations and of races cry out, consciously or unconsciously, for Christ as their only solution, when the experience of the past year has revealed anew to the Church the adequate resources which are available to faith and love through the grace of God, this Assembly here and now dedicates itself and calls upon the Church to consecrate herself afresh to a new obedience to the last command of our Glorified Lord and to a full acceptance of His leadership in the supreme task of making the Gospel known to all mankind and of establishing His Kingdom over all the world."

3. You describe the impression which you say is made upon the minds of Princeton Seminary students by their conferences with representatives of our Foreign Board. The two representatives of our Board with whom the students have most contact are members of the faculty of Princeton Seminary and the full evangelical loyalty of their personal convictions has, I think, not been questioned. It has on the other hand been vouched for repeatedly by the Board of Directors and is trusted throughout the Church. As to the Candidate Department of the Board the best evidence of its attitude is in its acts. It has not recommended the declination or discouragement of a single Princeton Seminary student because of doctrinal convictions. The only specific case which you cite, of the young man recently who had been working in the Continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada, met with no discouragement whatever. He was a most desirable candidate, and was at once and joyfully appointed.

The men wanted for foreign missions are men who firmly believe and who

know and have experienced the Gospel of the New Testament, and who are able and ready to go out to preach by word and life "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God" in the fullness of its New Testament meaning. So far from discouraging such men, the Board is eagerly seeking for them. And when they are found they are counselled to stand fast in the Scriptural faith and to go forth to proclaim the message of the Gospel in all their life and work and teaching. You say there is no clear evidence of this. On the other hand I think there is clear evidence in the instructions given in the annual conference with new missionaries and otherwise. For a single example I refer you to Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Post War Conference of the Board and all the Missions, entitled, "The Gospel of Paul."

4. You say that your impression of misgiving and distrust is strengthened by the blank which is sent to those whose names the candidate for missionary appointment gives as references, and you single out for criticism from the fifth item of character and equipment which are mentioned these three - "tolerance of the point of view of others," "desire to progress in spiritual truth," and "sanity", explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views." Surely you cannot mean to imply that these are undesirable qualities in Christian missionaries. There are, to be sure, limits to tolerance, just as to some other virtues, and it is not always easy to fix those limits. In your book on "The Origin of Paul's Religion" you carry as a scholar with great urbanity, the limits of tolerance of the point of view of others far beyond the point where anyone would dream of carrying them in cooperation with missionary service, but there would be nothing but pure separate individualism, as you have recognized in your books, if we were not prepared to work together within the evangelical fellowship in tolerance of the point of view of others. The question of the blank, as Mr. Hadley pointed out to you, covers simply that. And this Charles Hodge defended and advocated at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York in 1873 and Dr. Patton has nobly set forth in "Fundamental Christianity" and Dr. E. D. Warfield has emphasized in his Minority Report to the General Assembly of 1923 when, referring to our troubles at Princeton Seminary, he says, "In my judgment the root and ground of the difficulties are embodied in personalities, and so far as they are not embodied in personalities, they are embodied in the lack of that tolerance which we so strongly claim for ourselves and so generally deny to other." The question on the reference blank involves no more and nothing different from this - the ability of Christian men who hold the evangelical convictions of our Church to work together in harmony and good will and mutual tolerance.

And as to "desire to progress in spiritual truth" - that is one of the clearest admonitions of the New Testament: "Grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "Long for the spiritual milk which is without guile that ye may grow thereby unto salvation." "To walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." And how many more passages! It is men and women who long and strive for the fulfilment of these possibilities in their own lives who are wanted in Christian service at home and abroad.

And "sanity" meaning "absence of tendency to extreme views." Certainly the opposite of these qualities is not desirable. How carefully in your books do you guard against certain extreme views regarding the millennial hope, regarding mysticism, regarding extreme intellectualism and extreme experimentalism, and many others! And how earnestly Paul counsels men: "Let your moderation, your forbearance be known unto all men." "God gave us a spirit of power and love and of a sound mind." "Soberness" is one of his emphasized virtues and Peter's, too. "Be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer." "Wherefore girding up the loins

J. Gresham Machen

4/30/29

of your mind, be sober and set your hope perfectly on the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." This is true sanity, the sanity desired in minnionaries. (Cf. Gal. V. 23, II Peter I.6.)

And note the place of these questions and their relationship to other questions in the blank. "Tolerance of the point of view of others" is part of the eighth general subject. "teamwork qualities." Four are mentioned, as follows: "a. Tact. b. Tolerance of the point of view of others. c. Self-control. d. Flexibility. (Subordination when best of one's own ambitions and preferences.)" The tenth subject of inquiry is "Spiritual Qualities" and the subheads are: "a. Christian character. b. Vital religious experience. c. Spiritual influence on others." The eleventh subject is "Promise of Development in the Christian Life" and the subheads are: "a. Desire to progress in spiritual truth. b. Eagerness for Christian service. c. Sanity. (Absence of tendency to extreme views)." Then follow questions as to the experience of the candidate in various forms of practical work and Christian service.

To twist these simple and reasonable and wise questions and to freight them with suspicion is an untrue and unjust note in your paper.

5. You say that in the "Candidate Reference Blank" "there is not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the Gospel." That is covered (1) by the constitutional requirements of the Church with regard to the examinations of ordained candidates by their Presbyteries which are reported to the Board. (Frequent actions of the General Assembly have dealt with this matter of the functions of Mission Boards and Presbyteries in this regard. The question as respects the Foreign Board was passed upon by the Board and by the General Assembly in 1902 and 1903 when Dr. W. M. Paxton and Dr. Robert Russell Booth and Dr. John Fox, who were then members of the Board, were particularly concerned in the decisions reached, and in 1893, 1910 and 1921. (2) By the three questions to which most space is given and which are deemed the most important questions on the "Candidate Reference Blank", namely, "Would you recommend appointment?" "If not, what would seem to be the weak points or faults which in your judgment should disqualify the applicant from foreign mission work?" "Unhampered by any questions, please state frankly your own opinion as to the general fitness of the candidate for the work of a foreign missionary?" (3) By the inclusion in the Personal Application Blank filled out by every layman and woman candidate of the four Constitutional questions propounded by Presbyteries to candidates for ordination. (4) By the following questions: "What is your habit in devotional Bible study and prayer?" "Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord and Master?" "Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your missionary service, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?"

(5) By requiring from every candidate, ordained and unordained, a separate letter. The requirement is thus expressed on all application blanks:

"WRITE A SEPARATE LETTER giving in brief: (a) a sketch of your life; (b) Your Christian development and experience; (c) Your motives in seeking missionary appointment; (d) The content of your Christian Message."

As explaining what is involved the following statement is sent to every candidate

who is not under care and examination of a Presbytery:

"The Content of your Christian Message.

This question is vital. You propose to go to a foreign land in order to propagate the Christian religion, either by public address, or by personal contacts, or by both. It is of utmost importance that you should have a clear idea of what this religion is. Any positive statements upon Christian faith and practice which you wish to make should be set forth here, and will naturally include your idea of God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the redemptive work of Christianity, duties to your fellowmen, the Bible, the Church, together with such other leading truths as you would expect to embody in your message. Such condensation is desired as may be consistent with a satisfactory setting forth of your views."

Possibly you may never have seen this last statement. It has been in use for the past six years.

In the light of these statements I think your criticism of the blanks is untrue and unjust.

6. You criticize also the question on the application blank with regard to the ability of the candidate to "Cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your (his) own opinion," and you are dissatisfied with Dr. Hadley's explanation that this does not refer to theological convictions but to capacity to work with others happily in attending to our main common business and in pursuing our definite and united aim even though there may be differences of opinion over questions of method and policy and judgment, and other things too. Such ability to work with others is certainly important. In the Shantung Mission in China there were three strong personalities - Dr. Nevius, Dr. Mateer and Dr. Corbett. These men were wide apart in their opinions as to missionary policy and method, but they were able to adjust themselves and to establish and carry forward one of the best missions of our Church. Mr. Hadley was right in interpreting this question in this sense, as raising not the issue of evangelical theological views, which are the expected basis of missionary appointment, but "the question of temperament and ability to work in fullest harmony with people in the small group which is usually found in a mission station."

The question on the application blank is an old, old question. It has been used for many years; in its present form for the past seven years. It has never had any reference to theological views. They are covered, as I have pointed out, in other ways.

7. You criticize also the two questions which emphasize the "paramount duty" and "the chief aim" of each missionary "to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord and Master." Surely this is just what the Church wants to be assured of in its foreign missionaries, that everyone of them will set the spiritual, evangelistic purpose in the first place and, as the Board's Manual says, will make "all methods and forms of missionary service contribute to the realization of this aim." I shall refer later to your rejection of this statement of the missionary aim but I would refer here, though I shall refer again also to this, to your statement that the use in these questions of the terms "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" is "studiedly vague." That statement is both untrue and unjust. It is the kind of statement regarding your Christian brethren which both the Scriptures and the Standards of our Church forbid. I use the term "Saviour" and "Lord" and "Master", and my associates use them

and they are used by the Board in these questions in the same sense, in the full sense, in the sincere and explicit sense in which they are used in the Gospels, in the Book of Acts, in the Epistles and in the Revelation - in that sense and in no other. If you think that they are not adequate or that they are "studiedly vague" your controversy is with the New Testament whose meaning and authority in this and in all things I unreservedly accept and with whose very words I am content.

8. You refer to the fact that on May 8, 1928, "no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the foreign Board "were signers of the 'Auburn Affirmation', and that four of the five in the case of the Foreign Board are still members of the Board and that Mr. Hadley, the present Candidate Secretary of the Board, was also a signer, though at the time he signed he had not become a secretary of the Board. If I were a minister I would not have signed the "Auburn Affirmation". Nor would I sign any other except the great affirmation of our Confession: "The Supreme Judge can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures."

I have, however, just re-read the "Affirmation" and note the following positive declaration:

"We affirm and declare our acceptance of the Westminster Confession of Faith, as we did at our ordination, 'as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.' We sincerely hold and earnestly preach the doctrines of evangelical Christianity, in agreement with the historic testimony of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, of which we are loyal ministers.....

"We all hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines (i.e. the inspiration of the Bible, and the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Continuing Life and Supernatural Power of our Lord Jesus Christ); we all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God; that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and through Him we have our redemption; that having died for our sins He rose from the dead and is our everlasting Saviour; that in His earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works, and by His vacarious death and unfailling presence He is able to save to the Uttermost."

In their positive affirmation surely these men are as much entitled to be trusted and believed as you and I think we are, and if I understand at all the positions and principles of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. Patton there is basis here for righteous Christian cooperation.

9. The second part of your paper is devoted to my "utterances" as a "cause of disquiet regarding the Foreign Board." And the terms of your letter and the expressed suspicions and implied charges of your statement are a summons to self-defense. I have been associated with the foreign mission work of our Church in our Board for thirty-eight years. I have tried to serve faithfully and efficiently and I do not think the service needs to be vindicated to men. There is a Master whom you and I are both trying to serve and His judgment is the only judgment which need much concern us, and you and I are both clearly known to Him. But one is glad of the opportunity to bear His Christian witness to our Glorious Lord and His Gospel and to seek to relieve the foreign mission cause, to which long ago I gave my whole life from the suspicions and distrust which you think my utterances have brought upon it.

The chief ground of complaint and criticism in your statement with regard to me relates to the little book "Are Foreign Missions Done For?" and its statement of the aims of foreign missions. Inasmuch as this statement of aim is quoted in the book from the Board's Manual, where it has stood in its present form for many years, I am glad to retire for a time, with the little book, into the background and shall take up your attack on the statement of the Missionary aim, to which also reference was earlier made. The statement which you criticize is as follows:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

You object to this as "evasive and vague" and because it does not explicitly "declare the absolute necessity for every missionary of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God."

In reply I would say: (1) This statement of the supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions was prepared in its present form by a committee of the Post War Conference of the Board with representatives of the Missions held at Princeton in June 1920. The chairman of this committee was the Rev. J. Walter Lowrie, D.D., of China, later secretary of the Bible Union of China. It was he who helped to form this statement, which the Conference unanimously adopted for just what it was intended to be, no more and no less. It was not a statement of the doctrinal content of the Gospel message. It was the briefest possible declaration of the central purpose of missions with due subordination of its various elements. That central purpose most assuredly is to make known our Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world. (2) The statement is absolutely and faithfully Scriptural. It gathers together the words and thoughts of the Great Commission in its various forms: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." "And ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

All your criticisms of the aim as stated are equally applicable, some of them more so, to the last commands of our Lord. These commands do not mention the things you require to have mentioned. They do contain certain ideas which you disapprove. Your views explain away and even attack the clear meaning and the very words of the great Commission as Matthew records it.

(3) You summarize your criticism of the statement of aim by saying "In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the Word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the

precious blood of Christ." I think that any fair and candid Christian mind will find not only a hint of these things but far more than a hint in the plain, honest words of the aim if honorably and fairly minded. These and other elements of the Gospel would be included in a statement of the content of the message which the missionary is to make known, but they do not naturally or essentially fall in a sentence-statement of the central and controlling aim. That aim is to make our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, known to the world. Paul writes to the Ephesians, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints was this grace given to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Some of those riches he proceeds to unfold but by no means all, and he makes no mention of some of the particulars in which, of course, he believed but all of which he never attempted to summarize in any statement of his central, single missionary purpose.

I think you make three great mistakes here, (1) You confuse the statement of the aim of missions to proclaim the Gospel of Christ with the statement of the content of the message of the Gospel. (2) You allow your suspicion and distrust of others, your judging as you would not be judged, to deflect and poison your view. When you call Jesus Christ "Lord and Master" you say the words are used honestly, but when I call him so, the words are used dishonestly. This is "untrue and unjust." It is more than that. Paul says explicitly, "No man can say Jesus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit." You appear flatly to dispute Paul and to believe that men can call Jesus Lord by the evil spirit. Our Lord spoke some stern words about this kind of judgment. (3) You unmistakably imply that the failure specifically to mention certain great doctrines is evidence that those doctrines are not believed.

10. I will go on to deal specifically with this point. You say that "the vagueness which characterizes this utterance (i.e., the statement of aim) also characterizes the whole booklet, (i.e., "Are Foreign Missions Done For?") There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed, no mention of Scripture as such at all) no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ."

Before examining this statement and the implications which you put into it and the inferences which you draw out of it, I wish to make my position unmistakably clear. I am an evangelical Christian believer. I accept all the facts, all the doctrines, all the truths of the New Testament. I stated my convictions summarily in an article in the International Review of Missions, October 1923, on "Missionary Cooperation in Face of Doctrinal Difference", as follows:

"Before attempting to answer these questions, the writer of this paper ought perhaps, in order to avoid all misunderstanding, to state his own point of view. He accepts the whole of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament. He believes unqualifiedly every article of the Apostles' Creed. No language is adequate to state his conception of Christ. He believes that He is more and greater than any words can ever express, 'the Word made flesh,' God incarnate, reconciling the world to Himself, the only Saviour our Lord and our God. He believes in the truthfulness of the record of Christ's life, including His miracles, and rejoices with great joy in the miracle of the Virgin Birth and of the real Resurrection of Christ and of His future

personal advent. He believes that it is God alone who through Christ saves men, not by their characters, nor by any works of righteousness which they can do, but by His own grace through the death and life of His dear Son. As to the Bible, he accepts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession and regards its authority as supreme, not in faith only but also in the practice, conduct and religions of men. I am afraid this may seem to many very antiquated and unmodern, and the writer must be prepared to accept whatever limitations of value in the modern mind such views set upon his judgment as to the doctrinal limits of tolerance and the doctrinal basis of cooperation."

As to our Lord, I spoke fully and definitely in the Moderator's sermon at the General Assembly in 1928. I am no theologian and I did not and cannot speak in terms of systematized theology (which I respect and believe to be necessary) but I believe in the Saviour and His glory and His redeeming work as deeply and truly and lovingly as you can believe in Him. I tried to say this at the Assembly in Tulsa. These were some of the words I used:

"There is nothing good or great that we will not say about Jesus. There is no claim that we will not make for Him. There is naught that we can say about God that we will not say also about Jesus, 'the Son of His love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is above all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things He might have the preeminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens.'

"We will say about Jesus all that all the creeds have said and then we will say that He is more than this. All that men have said or even can say about His glory, His beauty, His power, His deity we will say. He is all this and He transcends all this. Here let us stand each for himself and all of us as Christ's Church and henceforth let no man trouble us for we bear in our mind and in our heart, in our spirit and in our body the marks of Lord Jesus.".....

"But all words fall short of the reality with regard to Christ. If He were nothing but a good dead man who spoke and wrought as wisely as He knew long ago in Palestine, who died bravely on a cross with no hate of those who did such hateful wrong, and over whose undisturbed grave the Syrian stars look down, then we should have much scruple lest we should wrong His memory with excess speech. Indeed long ago we should have found the adequate words to describe His humanity. But to us Jesus Christ is not a good dead man but God, the living God, our Risen and Living Saviour, and we will use all the language we have and deem it simple and poor to utter the wonder that is beyond all utterance.

"Nevertheless we can make our confession. We confess Him in the august symbols of our historic creeds and confessions."

You may not call these "vague and evasive" words. You may not call them, as you do call the sincere and earnest utterances of our missionaries and of the secretaries of our Board, "perfunctory lip service." If you do, you will have to answer before our Lord and Judge; nay you will receive even now in your mind and character God's inevitable penalty upon such un-Christian and UnChristlike judgment of a man on his fellow Christians. Let us both be mindful of our Master's words. (Matt. VII. 1-4).

Now let us examine this present criticism. (1) You say that my little book does not mention the Virgin Birth and its place in Christian faith. That is true. Neither is it mentioned in your book on "The Origin of Paul's Religion." You there set forth the details of Jesus' life which were known to Paul but you make no mention among them of the Virgin Birth. The single mention of it in your book "What is Faith?" is in the question which is asked in a purely incidental and secondary way, "What has it (i.e. simple trust like that of the Centurion) to do with a question of fact like the question of the Virgin Birth?" (p.91). You go on on this same page to state what we need to know about Jesus. You do not mention the Virgin Birth. Those two books are serious and competent theological studies. One might expect to find clear mention in them, especially in a discussion of "What is Faith?" of all that the writer deemed essential. You omit the Virgin Birth in these studies of the content of Paul's Gospel and of the Christian faith and then condemn my poor little booklet on our foreign mission duty because I do not mention a truth which I had no occasion to mention here but which I joyfully believe and have set forth elsewhere at greater length and particularity than I have seen or heard of in any writings of yours.

And are you prepared to condemn every book that does not set forth the Virgin Birth of our Lord and of absolute necessity of belief in it for all Christian preachers and teachers? Dr. Patton has written a noble book on "Fundamental Christianity." Surely he will deal with the Virgin Birth here as you require. Does he? Not once does he mention it save incidentally in the

mention of the Virgin Mary and the Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. In Dr. A. A. Hodge's "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes" there is, if I am not mistaken, a single reference to the Virgin Mary and not a word about the theological significance of the Virgin Birth. Even in the three great volumes of Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology" the index does not mention "Virgin Birth." It refers only to Roman ideas of the Virgin Mary. And in the text the fact and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth receive almost no attention. Under "Particular Passages which teach the Divinity of Christ" no reference is made to the Virgin Birth. Under the Person of Christ there are a few references to it, chiefly relating to the human nature in Jesus and the substance of His body. There is no reference whatever to the place of the Virgin Birth in the Christian message nor any such treatment of its theological significance as one finds, for example, in Du Bose's "Soteriology of the New Testament."

Do not misunderstand me. I believe in the Virgin Birth and I regard it, in Dr. George Alexander's words, as "a peculiarly precious truth." And I know that of course Dr. Patton believes it. But the idea that failure to mention it implies disbelief and that every book which omits it is unevangelical, is untrue and irrational. Consider the result of the application of your requirements here to the volume entitled "Biblical and Theological Studies by the Faculty of Princeton of the Founding of the Seminary" (1912). It is a great volume of 634 pages. Here, surely, one would feel that he had a right to expect a full statement of the Gospel which the Seminary was established to teach, a presentation of the essential and fundamental teaching of Christianity, setting forth with special clearness the Christian message for our time. Dr. Patton in his opening paper says, "My theme embraces the entire circle of theological learning." Your criticism of our statement of aim is that it is not enough to speak of the circle: all the contents of the circle must be explicitly spoken of also, and you name certain contents whose verbal omission is proof of unevangelicalism and of a vague and evasive insincerity. Well, let us see. This huge and sincere theological volume contains not a single reference to the Virgin Birth. The one reference to the second coming of Christ is in a paper by Dr. Erdman. That is the only one. There is a paper on "Sin and Grace in the Koran" but none on "Sin and Grace in the Gospel." There is a "Study of Jonathan Edwards" and another of "The Aramaic of Daniel" and another of "The Shepherd of Hermas" but none of "the truthfulness of the Scriptures", of "the new birth of believers" of "justification by faith", of "the atoning death of Christ." What if one should use your own words: "What sort of a Gospel is it from which all that makes a Gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away but so is the glory and the power." Those words might far more justly be used here than with regard to my little missionary book. This is a great theological presentation of the Gospel offered in commemoration of a century's life of a great school

whose business it is to set forth the content of the Gospel. But I will not use your words. I think the volume is a worthy Christian production and one of the best things in it is the passage in your paper, where, more adequately than any where else, you recognize (p.57b) the Pauline doctrine of the Resurrection. And I think its omissions are justified on the ground on which you justify omissions in Paul's Epistles, namely, "It is omitted not because it is unimportant but on the contrary because it is fundamental;" (p.562). I think that is a valid justification of these "Biological and Theological Studies" with their vast omissions. I think it is valid in the case of many omissions in your books. Will you not be equally fair-minded toward others?

(2) You say there is "no mention of the bodily resurrection" in my little book. The Resurrection is mentioned more than once and by that I mean the bodily Resurrection of our Lord, but I did not use the phrase. Neither have you used it in a single one of your three books which I have read. And it is not used in the New Testament. The New Testament is content to speak of the Resurrection, meaning the real and actual Resurrection of our Lord and I am content with the language of the New Testament. And as to the reality of the bodily Resurrection of our Lord I hold with Paul that it is the supreme fact and truth in Christianity.

(3) You say there is "no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture, (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all)." Again you are mistaken. The Bible, the New Testament, the Word of God, are all mentioned repeatedly. The full truthfulness of Scripture is everywhere assumed. I accept joyfully, and we expect each missionary to accept, the doctrine of our Standards with regard to the Scriptures. But I must honestly say that there is something which appears to be not altogether candid, I will not say "evasive", in your own references to the inspiration of the Scriptures. One notes the care with which you refrain from facing certain issues and from using the language of some of those whom you allow to think that you agree with them. And do you or do you not agree with Dr. Patton's position in "Fundamental Christianity"?

(4) You say there is "no mention of the supernatural return of Christ". Two of your three books make no mention of it. I find no mention of it in A.A. Hodge's "Popular Lectures." As for me I have cherished this faith and hope for forty-two years. My boyhood ministers, one a graduate of Princeton Seminary and all the orthodox of the orthodox, spiritualized this truth completely out of the Bible but I learned it at the Northfield Conference when I was a Sophomore in college and I have lived with it and in it ever since and have gladly borne some reproach because of it. I wrote a little book on it and have again and again preached it. I think I have borne ten times the witness to it which you have borne. But it did not seem to me to be necessary to introduce it into this little defense of missions. I was writing to defend foreign missions against their enemies. I did not realize that they would need to be defended from their friends.

(5) You say there is "no mention of the new birth of believers, and no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ." You qualify this by recognizing "one bare mention of the Crucified and ever-Living Lord." What would you think of the spirit of the statement that there was "one bare mention of the Virgin Birth" and "one bare mention of revelation" in "What is Faith?" But again you are mistaken. Those truths are either stated or implied or assumed in my booklet. More than this was not called for in the nature and purpose of the little book. It

was not an attempt to set forth the content of the Christian message. It was simply a short and earnest presentation of the claim that Christ is the only and the Sufficient Saviour.

11. The claims of Christ are not kept in the background. The little book is full of their assertion. It maintains, throughout, the sole sufficiency and universality of the Gospel: "Christ needs nothing from any one. No other religious teacher has any contribution to make to Him. In Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead. He is the final and sufficient revelation of God and the only Saviour and Redeemer of man. This is the New Testament representation. It is the solid and unalterable foundation of foreign missions. Foreign missions are not a search for a new and better religion. They are not an attempt to find something that is not already in Christ. They are the effort of those who have heard of Christ to take what they have heard to the whole world in order that all men together may learn more of him." (p.36). It conceives Christ, as the Scriptures do, as "the unconscious Desire of the Nations, the one answer to all the problems of the soul of man, his one Saviour and his only hope. A fundamental conviction for our Church in the work at home and abroad is this conviction that it has in Christ the sufficient Gospel. The Church is not looking for a new and different Gospel. It has found the one and only Saviour." "The Christian faith is a truth and a treasure greater than any other that we possess. It is our duty to share it and to appeal to all men everywhere to take it as their own. It is theirs by the same title that makes it ours and there are depths in it which will only be found as we explore them together apprehending with all saints, as alone we can, the full dimensions of the love of God, and all attaining, as the only way in which any of us can attain, the unity of the faith and the stature of the fulness of Christ. The truth that we need to keep in view and that it is easy to forget, is that Christ is greater than all our thoughts about Him and that as the whole world comes to know Him and to accept His Lordship new glories hitherto not seen in Him will appear. But these glories are in Christ. They are not in the religions or racial cultures of Asia. And the revelation of them will not come from those religions or cultures. It will come from Christ as the result of a larger belief by mankind in Him and a larger application of His grace and power to human life throughout the world. This is the lesson we need to remember. Our ideas about Christ may be true as far as they go, but they do not go far enough. We may not hold that they are complete. But Christ is complete. In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." (p.42). "Christ is absolute and final and He and His religion are to prevail absolutely and finally". "It is Christ that we Christians owe to all men here and throughout the world. If this position be regarded as narrow and fanatical, then we must accept such condemnation. Only we are sure that the same judgment must apply to the whole doctrine of the New Testament. The foreign missions enterprise recorded there rested upon precisely this view of the uniqueness and sufficiency of Christ. The early Church believed that there was none other Name given among men whereby they must be saved. All men everywhere needed Christ and Christ was enough. Neither Greek, nor Roman, nor Semitic religion had any correction to make or any supplement to add to Him. And the modern foreign missions enterprise stands on the same ground. It is the endeavor to make Christ known to all mankind, that all mankind together may live in Him and find in Him more and greater treasures than any one race or any one soul can find alone. Each race and each soul for itself can find in Him all that it knows that it needs, but only mankind altogether will discern the full depths of human want and the infinite fulness of Christ's supply. He is adequate indeed to the full needs of each soul only because He is the whole world's sufficient Saviour:

'In Him is life provided
For all mankind and me.'

"I would rejoice to see the missionary enterprise brought in our day more clearly and loyally and uncomplainingly than ever to those fundamental ideas with which it began, and to see it disentangled, as far as we can disentangle it, from a great many of the compromising fellowships in which it finds itself, and released to do its pure, elementary, rational work down at the foundations of human life in relating men one by one to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour." (p. 102) "grant that a man's judgment here will depend altogether on what his estimate is of Jesus Christ. If Jesus Christ means nothing to him, why, he will not see any necessity on the part of other men for knowing about Him. But if Jesus Christ is all there is for us, if we know that He is all there is, then we cannot but recognize the inherent obligation in wealth like that to be shared with all who have not yet come into its possession." (p.108) "The missionary enterprise is the proclamation of the One Name given under Heaven among men whereby we must be saved, and there is nothing in any non-Christian religion to be added to the glory of Christ or to the fulness of the revelation of Christ, howbeit we so imperfectly apprehend it still. Inside the Christian spirit burns the old resolution that glowed in St. Paul's heart to whom it would have been 'woe', if he had not shared the Christ he knew. Would that we might get back again to the foreign missionary enterprise in the pure, naked spiritual reality of it, as Christ called that little group of men and women around Him at the first, who had no nations back of them, who were not going to speak for any race. They were just a little group of individuals whom Christ had redeemed and who knew their Redeemer, and He told them to go out and share what they had in Him with all the world. That is what the missionary enterprise has always been. That is what it is today. - Christianity stripped of all accessories and secondary accoutrement, just Christ, Himself, to be offered to the whole world for which He died." (p. 141).

These are only a few expressions from this little book. It is a poor little thing but it is not the vague and evasive and unevangelical thing you allege. And of the hundreds of evangelical men and women who have written or spoken about the book you are the only one of whom I have heard who condemns it. One of the warmest and most grateful of the letters of commendation is from an old friend, Dr. Albertus Pieters, of Holland, Michigan, as conservative in his theology as you can ever hope to be. There is enough evidence in sheaves of letters at hand that the little book has fortified evangelical conviction and confirmed true missionary devotion. I will not quote them - yet I will quote from several that you may know the feeling of some not one whit less zealous than you:

"I have just finished the reading of your book, so kindly sent to me, entitled 'Are Foreign Missions Done For?' It is now after twelve o'clock p.m. I cannot express to you the joy I received in reading it. After having much of my former zeal for missions dampened by recent post graduate studies in the University of - and the coldness of the churches that I have tried to interest in a feeble way, I now rededicate myself anew to the task of missions and resolve to do my best to give and stimulate giving in the little church I am called to serve. "I can fully appreciate the difference between 'The religion of the good dead man' and the 'Religion of a good living God.'"

 "On the day that your little book 'Are Foreign Missions Done For?' came to us, I read it and decided to write you at once in regard to a further distribution of it. I probably felt that you know your own business, but in the light of some college periodicals recently received I know my first impulse was right. "I would like to have the whole thing, or perhaps only the chapter

'Christ is Enough' printed for large distribution among our college organizations."

"The more I read this volume the more I am impressed with its value and importance, coming especially at this time. It is the ablest defense or justification of Foreign Missions that has yet been sent forth. It will be sure to strengthen those who are faltering and win over those who are hostile or who are lukewarm and indifferent. The great Head of the Church must have put it into your heart to write it and I am sure will use it in stirring the whole Church up to a renewed sense of its great responsibility in regard to the whole matter."

"For quite a long time I have wanted to write to you. After reading your recent booklet, 'Are Foreign Missions Done For?' I cannot refrain from writing. I want to thank you with all my heart for the stand and the message in that booklet. Fundamentally, while defending the foreign mission movement from modern criticism, it is a call back to the original motive of foreign missions. I found myself in complete agreement with every page of the book."

"I have just read 'Are Foreign Missions Done For?' at one sitting and I can't resist saying how wonderful it is. To my mind it is the most unanswerable argument I have ever seen. I do hope somebody is giving it wide circulation. There is too much loose talk going about, even among people who know better, about one religion completing or complementing another. You are right, Christianity needs no completion - it is complete - it needs discovery."

"Reading this wonderful little book of yours I feel convinced that you still stand firm on the old reliable Faith once delivered unto the Saints."

This last is from the "Church of the Lutheran Brethren." I am ashamed to have quoted these. I dare to use Paul's words: "I am become foolish; ye have compelled me."

12. There is much more in your statement which should be reviewed, but I have written quite enough and more than ought to have been required. I could answer some of your criticisms by quoting from your own books the statement of the very truths for which you condemn me. There are two things more of which I shall speak. The first is this: I find myself in deep and thankful accord with almost all of your great convictions. I am full of admiration and gratitude for "The Origin of Paul's Religion" and agree with you in your emphasis on the historicity and supernaturalness of the facts of Christianity's beginning and the necessity of the great Christian doctrines undetachable from these facts, on the need of reasoned doctrinal statement and defense, on the great doctrines of sin and faith, on the Person of Christ, on miracles, on Christianity as a message as well as an experience and a life, and I might go on with a long list of all the evangelical convictions. Where I differ from you is at the points where, as it seems to me, you differ from the Scriptures. Some great Scripture truths you ignore or qualify. You twist or interpret some passages out of their plain and obvious statement. You use non-Scriptural, even

anti-Scriptural forms of thought and expression. When apparently contradictory ideas or statements are found in the New Testament you modify one or the other or both to fit your scheme of thought instead of accepting them both just as they are without qualification as parts of larger truth or life which comprehends them both without any minimization. You do no justice to Paul's moral and social applications of the Gospel and you even indulge in a fling at some ministers who read the sixth chapter of Ephesians to their people. There are illustrations in your paper which we are considering. There you use some words in your statement of essential doctrine which are not found in the Scriptures at all. I can state my convictions wholly in the very words of the Scriptures. You use repeatedly the phrase "the gospel of the Cross". This phrase is not in the Scriptures. The New Testament knows "the Gospel", "the Gospel of Christ", "the Gospel of the Kingdom", "the Gospel of peace," "the Gospel of God," "the everlasting Gospel," but it nowhere uses the phrase "the Gospel of the Cross" and the use which you make of that phrase implies interpretations both of the idea of the "Gospel" and of the idea of the Cross which do not do justice to the full New Testament teaching. The Gospel is not the Gospel of the Cross only, not even of the Cross of Christ only. The Gospel is the Gospel of Christ which includes the Cross and what preceded the Cross and what followed the Cross. The same defect marks your use of the idea of "salvation only by the Cross," and your criticism of my reference to the "redeeming life" of Christ. Your view certainly does not do full justice to the Scriptures nor does it represent the true Scriptural proportion of truth. You say in "What is Faith?" "Christ touches our lives, according to the New Testament through the Cross." (p.143 But compare Heb. II,18; IV.,15,16) "The Cross of Christ is the special basis of Christian faith". (p.144- But compare I.Cor.XV. 17). "The Cross by which salvation was wrought." (your statement; But compare Rom. 1.16,V.10). You do not and cannot too much exalt the Cross of Christ, but you can and you do fail to set it in its Scriptural place and relationship and you neglect to relate it adequately to the full truth of the New Testament. You do not give their full Scriptural place to the Incarnation prior to the Cross or to the Resurrection and many other aspects of the full truth of the Gospel. You justly emphasize the fact of the Resurrection and its evidential significance but you do not adequately set forth its relation to the redeeming work of Christ, its place in our salvation, or its practical and dynamic significance in the life of the believer as the New Testament sets forth all these aspects. You do indeed in brief references couple the Cross and the Resurrection in their relation to salvation. In "What is Faith?" you speak of "the Gospel of redemption through the Cross and resurrection of Christ" (p.p. 154,151). Also "The Origin of Paul's Religion," p.167. In view of your criticism of my use once of the word "Spirit" with a small "s", one notes that you habitually write "Cross" and sometimes of late, though not earlier, Virgin Birth with a capital and "resurrection" without it.) But you criticize my truly Scriptural reference to the "redeeming life" of Christ (Rom. VI.,I-II; VII:4; VIII:I-I4).

The New Testament teaching is far richer and freer than your view appears to be. It teaches not that the Cross saves us or that we are saved by the Cross. It teaches that Christ saves us, and that He saves us by Himself, by His death and by His life. How rich is Paul's orientation and proportion of these truths! "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." (Rom. V.,8-II). Let any one take his New Testament and read it through,

4/30/29

marking every reference to the Cross and the death of Christ and every reference to the Resurrection and the life of Christ and compare the result with the proportions of these glorious facts and doctrines in your emphasis. "Christ died for our sins" you quote often and you cannot quote too often. But only occasionally do you add "according to the Scriptures", and still less frequently do you complete the quotation and add "And He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." Of course you believe this and rejoice in it, but you do not relate these truths as Paul does and you substitute the Cross which might have been without the Resurrection for the place of the Resurrection which included the Cross. The Cross without the Resurrection would not have saved us, Paul proceeds in this very chapter to declare in language which takes our breath away: "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins" (I. Cor. XV.17) And one might go on to speak of Peter's teaching of the relation of the Resurrection to regeneration and salvation. This full Gospel of the New Testament is the glorious Gospel. I do not share your view that it can only be preached offensively. The Cross is indeed to many a stumbling block. Paul and Peter both realized and declared this. Paul also said: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God. Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye imitators of me, even as I am of Christ. Giving no offense in anything, that the ministry be not blamed. But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." There is clearly in Paul's view a vast difference between the preaching of the offense of the Cross and the offensive preaching of the Cross. The word for "offence" which Paul uses in Gal. V.11 and I. Cor. II.,23 and which Peter uses in I. Peter II.,8 is the very same which Paul uses in Rom. XIV.,13 and XVI.,17, and which the Saviour uses in His dreadful warning in Luke XVII.1,2, and which in the American Standard Revised is translated in all these passages not "offence" or "offend", but "stumbling block" or "cause to stumble." It were well if we remembered these words in our Christian fellowship within and in our proclamation of Christ and His Gospel to those who are without: "Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences will come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones." "Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge thus rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way." I know that in the parallel passage in Matthew the words "little ones" are followed by the words "that believe in Me" but surely the Spirit of Christ would not have us think that the Tender Shepherd of His little ones, who left the ninety and nine safe sheep in the fold to hunt the one that was lost, would be pleased with the thought that His disciples should measure their fidelity by their success in "offending", in "causing to stumble" the feet that are out of the way.

And a great deal more might be said of the failure of your books to set forth "the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God," to use your own phrase. But I do not suspect or reproach you as heretical or unevangelical. I believe that God and the Gospel and its grace are supernatural and infinite and if they are, while we may know them surely and truly, we may know, as Paul himself says, only in part. But we are Christ's true disciples none the less, and we ought to love one another and walk together "comforted each of us by the other's faith", and making up each of us what is lacking in the other.

Perhaps you will be tempted to dismiss what I have just been saying as the simple, unsophisticated talk of one who is unschooled in theological systematization and no scholar in the field of theological controversy. It is even so. I do not pretend to be anything but a simple, Bible Christian who holds that under the grand liberty of our Confession he is free to believe all that he finds in the Scriptures as he finds it there and to reject whatever he sees which contradicts or deflects or malforms the rich and varied truth of the Scriptures. If anything that I say here or elsewhere is at variance with the Scriptures, if it declares what the Scriptures do not truly declare, or fails to declare what the Scriptures do truly declare, I shall be glad to have it shown and shall rejoicingly leave any error for the truth. Is this not evangelical?

(2) And now lastly, you say "What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified - not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board?" I do not like the slurring reference to the light which the sacrifice of life by men may help us to see in the divine fulness of the meaning of the death of Christ. But your question can be answered with an answer absolutely flat and clear. I ask you to read Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Conference of the Board and the Missions in 1910 on "The Gospel of Paul." There the Gospel is described which the Board exists to spread abroad. The Foreign Board exists and its missionaries are appointed and maintained for one supreme purpose, namely, to proclaim to the world the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Alive for Evermore, the Sinless One, the only Saviour, "who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power eternal. Amen."

I said at the outset that I would speak finally of your paper as a whole. Perhaps, however, it is hardly necessary to do this except to say that the particular items of evidence which you have presented as justifying your negative answer to the query "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" appear to me to be inadequate and, as I have sought to show, so unfounded, that one wonders how a just and brotherly Christian view could have rested upon them so grave an inquiry and so grave a proposal as the establishment of a rival foreign missionary agency in our Church, independent of the General Assembly and supported by members of our Church who proclaim their fellow members to be unevangelical. And you rest this inquiry and this proposal on unwarranted impressions regarding a few questions on the "Reference Blank", a few thoroughly sensible and right letters from Mr. Hadley in explanation, a criticism of a Scriptural statement of our missionary aim, a few random and detached quotations from things that I have written, a mass of your own suspicions, and arguments from silences which your own books would not bear. My utterances which you have quoted are, I believe, both true and Scriptural out you might have quoted, if you had willed or known, a great mass of statements in addresses and books which you could not misuse as you have misused those in your paper. A man like you, devoted to scholarship, could not give his time to reading such simple books as mine, but they are loyal books, and their teaching has sought to be faithful to our Divine Lord and His Word.

The paper, as a whole, is as "Untrue and unjust" as it is in detail. It is not worthy of you or of the Gospel or of the fellowship of the Gospel. And I do earnestly trust that what I have said in this letter will lead you to lay it aside, to dismiss your distrust and to join generously and faithfully in our great task of carrying to the non Christian people the Gospel of Christ, "the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God." And look at the real work before us here at home - in ignorance and unbelief, in slackness of moral and social standards, in sin and infidelity, in imperfection and unworthiness of faith and life in the Church, in the need of men everywhere for Christ. Contend for the faith within the Church but with equal zeal proclaim it to those who are without.

And now one more quotation from what you have written, not in this present statement of yours with its proposal of division and schism in our Church and its work, but in the closing paragraph of your book "Christianity and Liberalism."

"Is there no refuge from strife? Is there no place of refreshing where a man can prepare for the battle of life? Is there no place where two or three can gather in Jesus' name, to forget for the moment all those things that divide nation from nation and race from race, to forget human pride, to forget the passions of war, to forget the puzzling problems of industrial strife, and to unite in overflowing gratitude at the foot of the Cross? If there be such a place, then that is the house of God and that the gate of heaven. And from under the threshold of that house will go forth a river that will revive the weary world."

Yes, this is the place. But once again we cannot stop at the Cross. Beyond that there was an empty tomb and a Risen and Living Lord. "United with Him in the likeness of His Death", shall we not also be united with Him and therefore with one another "in the likeness of His Resurrection." Can we not, my friend, put away all this bitterness and railing and suspicion and be kind and tender-hearted and trustful? And can we not be spared the shame and waste of such a baseless controversy as a controversy like this between you and me would be and give ourselves and all our strength to better and truer things. Is not Paul's counsel, "walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time," doubly applicable to our relationship and our work within the company of us who truly love and wish truly to serve our Common Lord?

If what I have written does not avail to persuade you and if you still think that it is your duty to publish your paper, surely it is only fair and right that my answer should be published with it. In that case I am prepared to meet my proportionate share of the expense. But, my dear friend, there is a more excellent way.

Very faithfully yours,

The paper, as I recall, is an "introduction" as it is in detail. It is not worthy of you or of the Gospel or of the fellowship of the Gospel. And I do earnestly trust that what I have said in this letter will lead you to let it slide, to dismiss your distrust and to join generously and faithfully in the great task of carrying to all our Christian people the Gospel of Christ, "the full creature creation of the Word of God," and look at the real conditions as they are - in ignorance and unbelief, in lack of moral and social standards, in sin and iniquity, in infidelity and unworthiness of faith and life in the Church, in the need of men everywhere for Christ. Content for the faith within the Church but with equal zeal proclaim it to those who are without.

And now the more quotations from what you have written, not in this present statement of yours with its proposal of division and schism in our Church and its work, but in the closing paragraph of your book "Christianity and Missions."

"Is there no refuge from battle? Is there no place of refreshing where a man can prepare for the battle of life? Is there no place where the words of the Holy Spirit are given in Jesus' name, so forgetful for the moment of those things that divide nations from nations and race from race, to seek common ground, to forget the possibility of war, to forget the appalling prospect of fratricidal strife, and to unite in overlooking substitutes at the feet of our Christ. If there be such a place, then that is the place to find and that that part of heaven. And from under the threshold of that house will go forth a river that will revive the weary world."

Yes, this is the place. But once again we cannot stop at the Cross. Beyond that there was an empty tomb and a risen and living Lord. "United with Him in the likeness of His Death", shall we not also be united with Him and with others with one another "in the likeness of His Resurrection." But we are, my friends, put away all this bitterness and railing and suspicion and be kind like those who started the spiritual and let us not be spend the time and waste of such a baseless cost over a mere contrivance like this between you and we would be we give ourselves and all our strength to neither one power to let, is not God's command, shall in which towards each other and direct, redemptive love, truly and kindly to our relationship and one with within the coming of us that truly love and work truly to serve our common Lord.

If what I have written here has not availed to help you and if you still think that it is your duty to continue your paper, surely it is only fair and right that my answer should be published with it. In that case I am prepared to meet my proportional share of the expense. But, my dear friends, there is a more excellent way.

Very faithfully yours,

4/2/28

Reply To
Dr. Machen's Pamphlet - "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions
of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."

This pamphlet of 110 pages was sent out by Dr. Machen just before the meeting of the Presbytery of New Brunswick in Trenton, New Jersey, on April 11, 1933. I received a copy on April 10th but had no time to give it a careful reading until after the meeting of the Presbytery. Even if I had had time, I think I should still have done as I did, and confined myself to the statement presented here as Chapter V. The only thing on which the Presbytery was called to vote was the proposed overture. ^{That was} the matter to be dealt with, not the statements of Dr. Machen, which might have been answered one by one without altering at all Dr. Machen's attitude, which does not rest on the arguments which he presents in the pamphlet but which existed before most of these incidents occurred and would exist if they had not occurred.

Now, however, I propose to deal with them.

First, a word should be said with regard to the introduction which Dr. Machen has prepared to the edition of the pamphlet issued since the meeting of the Presbytery. Dr. Machen says here that after he and I had each used the hour allotted to us, the previous question was moved in accordance with my expressed desire not to engage in controversy. I expressed no such desire. I said I did not intend to engage in either controversy or debate but was present at the Presbytery's invitation simply to try to help it ^{to} think and act aright in the matter of the proposed overture. No expressed desire of mine had anything whatever to do with the moving of the previous question. Dr. Machen further says "No sensible person can have confidence in a Board which does not welcome open discussion of its policies with those to whom it appeals for funds." The Board welcomes all fair and just discussion now and always. As to the phrase, "those to whom it appeals for funds," Dr. Machen declares that he does not support the Board and advises others not to do so. And his statement declares that the Board "is deeply involved in Modernist and destructive propaganda." This statement is not true and the evidence presented does not justify it. What is this evidence? The Pamphlet is in seven sections. It must suffice to deal with what is crucial in each.

1. "The Attitude of the Board of Foreign Missions toward the book-
'Re-Thinking Missions'".

The Board has no responsibility whatever for this book or for the movement which produced it. When the movement was launched the Board did what it could, which was not a great deal, to influence it and hoped for real good as a result of it. It gave expression to this hope which so far from being reprehensible as Dr. Machen thinks, was the right and Christian thing to do. Two members of the Board, purely as individuals, were on the Committee which projected the inquiry, as were members of other evangelical churches but these had nothing to do with writing the Report. As individuals they assented to its publication. Like others they no doubt both agree and disagree with it. They are both loyal evangelical Christian believers.

When the report appeared two courses were open to the Board: to ignore the Report, or to express its mind with regard to it. If the Board had taken the former course it would have been still more severely criticised. by Dr. Machen The Board felt that it must make it clear that it had no responsibility for the Report and that it must express its mind both for its own sake and for the sake of the Church, and it did so with perfect clearness in the manner which comports with the dignity and tradition of the Church. It set forth the six fundamental issues on which its position was at variance with the position of the Report. It did so positively and unequivocally and then, like the honorable and truthful body that it is, it recognized elements of good in the criticisms and suggestions of the Report as to some of the methods of missionary activity, which, it said, could be acknowledged only as "taken apart from its theological basis." The Board's actions and the various statements which it has sponsored have been recognized throughout the Church and around the world as a clear and unmistakable affirmation of the Biblical evangelical basis and nature of the work of foreign missions ~~has~~ held unshakably by our Board and Church. The Board is not open to criticism because it spoke with dignity and self respect and not with violence and malediction. No statements from any Church or missionary body have been more clear and complete than those which have gone from our Board.

II. "The Case of Mrs. J. Lossing Buck."

All those who have had any responsibility in this matter are content to endure the assaults which have been made upon them from one side by Dr. Machen and from the other by the "Christian Century", and the magazines. This "case" will be judged by One higher than all of us and we will await His judgment. Mrs. Buck's published views are not in accord with the faith she professed when she was first appointed a missionary and with the faith of the Church, but a great deal needs to be considered of which the critics of Mrs. Buck and the Board are ignorant and must be allowed to remain ignorant. It is enough to say that the Board has tried to act as a Christian agency with its obligations to our Lord Jesus Christ ever in mind and that it has acquiesced in Mrs. Buck's honorable request to be released from connection with it with deep regret that there could not have been another and very different issue.

III. "The Board of Foreign Mission and the Auburn Affirmation."

The proper place to deal with this matter is in the courts of the Church. Whether signers of this Affirmation have by such signature violated their ordination vows is not an issue to be settled by any method of indirection. It cannot be so settled. One and only one honorable and constitutional way is open to Dr. Machen and that is by the due process provided in the Constitution of the Church. The position which apparently Dr. Machen is seeking to establish is that because a secretary or a member of one of the Boards of the Church signed the Auburn Affirmation he is thereby disqualified as a Presbyterian minister and is ineligible to service of the Church, no matter how clearly and positively he may declare his complete loyalty to his ordination vows and his specific acceptance of the great affirmations of the Confession of Faith in the very terms of the Confession. This is an issue, however, which can only be constitutionally determined by the Presbytery to which the individual involved belongs. It is wholly conceivable that there should be ecclesiastical organizations where such a question would be determined by the local congregation or by the national body as a whole, but this is not Presbyterianism. Such a course is forbidden by the Constitution of our Church. To propose or to attempt to pursue such a course

is to ignore and contravene the law and order of our Church as embodied in the authoritative constitution. It is wrong constitutionally and ethically to use the missionary and educational agencies of the Church as a device for escaping responsibility in meeting this issue in a legal and righteous way. Until this issue has been determined in the proper and constitutional manner which alone is tolerable in the Presbyterian Church, it is not competent for Dr. Machen to attack, as he is doing, the good faith, the honor, the Christian character of Mr. Hadley. Mr. Hadley, as will appear in a later chapter, is absolutely loyal to his ordination vows and to the faith of our Church.

IV. "Modernist Propaganda by the Candidate Department."

Dr. Machen's statement here is partial and unfair. It is worse than this. It is not true, as he intimates, that the candidate secretaries have used their opportunity not for Christ but for anti-Christ. (p.27) Such a grave charge is utterly unsubstantiated by his evidence. What is the "spirit of the anti-Christ?" John says that it is the spirit that "confesseth not" or "annulleth" Jesus. The Candidate Secretaries, on the contrary, believe and constantly affirm their belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God according to the Scriptures. And John says plainly that the spirit that makes this confession is not the spirit of anti-Christ but is the Spirit of God (I John IV,2,3). The suggestion of such books as were mentioned in the letters of Mr. Hadley and Mrs. Corbett, written by Oldham and Fosdick and Fleming, is no warrant for such an enormity as the charge that these two devoted Christians, both of whom gave their lives to service in China, are serving anti-Christ. There are things in some of these books to which I believe that just objection may be made but such a single incident as this is no adequate ground for a charge of serving anti-Christ or of anti-evangelical propaganda. To hold them responsible for a statement made by Middleton Murray quoted in Oldham's "Devotional Diary" and to represent this "Diary", which has been used with great blessing, by this quotation and one phrase in it, is preposterous. Furthermore, Dr. Machen does not know and ignores completely all the noble work these candidate secretaries have done in trying to guide young people into the truth of the New Testament and in seeking earnestly to safeguard and strengthen the evangelical faith of missionary candidates. The correspondence files will establish to the satisfaction of any fair-minded judge the evangelical loyalty of these faithful workers.

Dr. Machen says that the Candidate Department speaks of "Re-Thinking Missions" as "being essentially a Christian book." Whatever one may think of that book the Candidate Department has made no such statement about it. Here as elsewhere and especially as we shall see, in his address at the New Brunswick Presbytery, Dr. Machen inveighs against the validation of the Christian message in and by Christian life and experience and declares that "the deadliest enemy of Christianity all over the world today" is not unfaithfulness of life, or disobedience to the will of God, or un-Christian conduct, or the denial by deed of the Christian profession of faith, or hatred or bitterness, but "modern non-doctrinal religion." Christianity is indeed a doctrinal religion and the acknowledgment and proclamation of the truth of its doctrine and its historic facts are essential, but its deadliest enemy today is not more the foolish and fatal denial of doctrine than the proclamation of a doctrine that is not the full New Testament doctrine, or the declaration of a faith that is not confirmed by deeds of obedience and love. There are no plainer assertions in the New Testament than those which forbid the separation of faith and works, of belief and life. And if distinctions are to be made the only valid one for us who believe in the New Testament is the distinction of Paul in a passage which I do not remember ever to have seen quoted by Dr. Machen - "And now abideth faith, hope and love, these three, and the greatest of these is love."

And as to Christian experience, Dr. Machen says Peter "said nothing about his own experience" in his first missionary sermon, and that when Paul preached "it never seemed to have occurred to him to try to save men by the power of his vivid personality." It would be folly for any man to try to do so today, but what a strange perversion of the New Testament! Who can read the Epistles of Paul and Peter and possibly miss the constant glorious witness to what Christ was to them and in them, and the eagerness of their hearts to have others find in Him the salvation, the power, the joy which they had found. What but their own experience were they declaring when they said: "I will not dare to speak of anything save those which Christ wrought through me." (Romans XV:18). "My speech and my preaching were in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." (I Cor. II, 4) "Our gospel came not unto you in word only but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and in much assurance; even as ye know what manner of men we showed ourselves toward you for your sake. And ye became imitators of us and of the Lord." (I Thess. 1, 5, 6). "To me to live is Christ." (Phil. I, 21). "I beseech you therefore be ye imitators of me." (I. Cor. IV, 16). "Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body." (II Cor. IV:10). Was Paul not referring to his own experience in Gal. II, 20, Col. I, 24-29, I Tim. I, 16, and II Tim. I, 12? Paul indeed preached not himself but Christ Jesus as Lord, his Lord, whom he knew in his own experience, an experience to which he dared ever to appeal. And as to Peter, if he did not refer to his own experience in his first sermon he certainly referred to it afterwards in Acts XI and I Peter I, 3-5. In his great zeal for certain aspects of truth, Dr. Machen depreciates or even disallows other aspects.

But what folly it is to separate doctrine and life! This is the very separation denounced by our Lord (Luke VI, 46-49; Matt. VII, 21; XXI, 29, 30), and by James (James II, 14-25). Christianity has not one but two deadly enemies - one is the error of no thinking or wrong thinking and the other is the error of a loveless and unChristlike life.

V. "Reference Blanks: Application Blanks and Information given to Candidates."

I have dealt with this in Chapter V of this statement but am glad here to say a further word about the constant practice of Dr. Machen of setting up contrasts and separations alien to the New Testament. "According to the Bible", he says in this section, "a man is not saved by following Christ; he is not saved by loving Christ; he is not saved by surrendering to Christ; but he is saved by faith. And that is an entirely different thing. If he were saved by surrender, or by following Christ or by love he would be saved by some high and noble quality or action of his own. But when he is saved by faith, that means that he is saved by God and God alone and that the manner by which God saved him is to work faith in him." Yes, but faith is not all that God works in him and the work is manifestly not God's work unless it includes both faith and surrender and obedience and love; and faith is not faith that is only opinion and not surrender and obedience and love. All these are God's work and God in His Word does not sanction their separation. The fruit of the Spirit is not single. Paul says it is nine-fold and the seventh item is "faith", identically the same Greek word that is used elsewhere in the New Testament for "faith". It is wholly unscriptural to separate faith and deal with it as a work of God detached from His whole will for men in Christ.

Dr. Machen goes on, "The means by which God saves him is to work faith in him and to lead him, relinquishing all confidence in his own goodness, just to look at the crucified Saviour and say, Thou hast died in my stead. I accept the gift at Thy hand, O Lord." True, blessedly true, but not all the truth of the New Testament. There is not a word here of the Resurrection. The crucified Saviour was not all to Paul. Note his bold words in I Cor. XV, 14. The gospel as Dr. Machen states it here and elsewhere (though of course he believes in the Resurrection

with all his mind) makes too little of the Resurrection, and saving faith is not faith in the Crucified Saviour only, it is faith in the Risen Saviour and it is as important to say the latter as the former - Paul said it was more important. (And cf. I Peter III: 21)

And also the man who truly looks in faith to the Crucified and Risen Saviour says something more than Dr. Machen suggests. He does indeed say "Thou hast died in my stead, I accept," but he adds:

"Were the whole realm of nature mine
That were a present far too small,
Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my life, my soul, my all."

VI. "Various indications of the Attitude of the Board to Secretaries and the Agencies with which the Board is Cooperating."

The particulars here are the Lakeville,, Lausanne and Jerusalem Conferences, Mr. Eddy and Mr. Kagawa, Dr. Scott, Dr. Mackay, Dr. McAfee, Dr. Reischauer and Mr. Speer. With the Lausanne Conference, Mr. Eddy and Mr. Kagawa, whatever one may think of them for good or ill, the Board had had absolutely no connection. As to the Lakeville and Jerusalem Conferences, let any one read the full report of the former and volume one of the latter on "The Christian Message", especially Chapter X, and if he is a fair-minded person he will see for himself how completely Dr. Machen has misunderstood or misrepresented these conferences. In the case of the officers and missionaries of the Board of whom he speaks, he has rendered no just or righteous judgment. In some matters, as of the discussion at the Foreign Missions Conference in December 1932, he speaks in tragic ignorance. In his criticisms of Dr. Mackay he does not truly represent his articles, and the statements to which he takes exception can each one be justified with the clearest proof from the New Testament. The truths which Dr. Mackay was presenting, and which Dr. Machen says are "disquieting", are truths taught and enjoined by our Lord and by Paul again and again. Dr. Machen's controversy must be with them. As to his criticism of me I have earnestly and prayerfully sought for its ground. It cannot be in my Christian conviction for I have told Dr. Machen that I hold absolutely to the Christianity of the New Testament, that I believe every word of it and can state my faith in its very words, that if he will show any opinion of mine to be at variance with it I will at once change that opinion. The only substantial points of disagreement which he states in this pamphlet, are with regard to the confusion of the "spiritual" and the "supernatural" and with regard to the relation of Christianity to the Old Testament Dispensation. As to the former I can state my view about the supernatural character of Christianity in the words of Dr. Warfield: "The confession of a supernatural God, who may and does act in a supernatural mode, and who acting in a supernatural mode has wrought out for us a supernatural redemption, interpreted in a supernatural revelation, and applied by the supernatural operation of His Spirit - this confession constitutes the core of the Christian profession." I only wish, however, that Dr. Warfield had specifically mentioned, with the name of God and His Spirit, the name of His supernatural Son Jesus Christ. But as to this word "supernatural", it is notable that it does not occur in the Bible and that Paul's contrast is precisely the one which Dr. Machen criticises, namely "natural" and "spiritual." (I. Cor. XV, 44, 46: Romans VII, 14; I Cor. II, 14, Eph. VI, 12). As to the relation of Christianity to the Old Testament Dispensation, I have no other view than that which our Lord set forth in the Sermon on the Mount and Paul in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, and as ~~we~~ set forth, one would think unmistakably, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. CA

The real issue, however, I judge, is in the matter of attitude to men of different opinions. Dr. Machen thinks that "three positions are possible and are actually ^{being} taken today. In the first place, one may stand unreservedly for the old Faith and unreservedly against the indifferent tendency in the modern Church; in the second place, one may stand unreservedly for Modernism and against the old Faith; and in the third place, one may ignore the seriousness of the issue and adopt a 'middle of the road' position." But these are not the only possibilities. The first of these groups is divided into two. They agree in holding to the historic evangelical faith. They agree in condemning indifferentism. They agree in recognizing the seriousness of the issue. But they disagree as to how they shall act to and speak of persons from whose opinions they differ. There are some who denounce not error only but also those who, as they believe, err. They would cast them out of their fellowship with anathema and malediction. There are others who believe that they are following the New Testament view when they bear their witness to what they regard as truth with unreserved and constant utterance, but who would keep as close to those with whom they differ as they can, in the hope of winning them to the truth and in fear of violating our Lord's commandment: "And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out demons in Thy name and we forbade him because he followeth not with us. But Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you." (Luke IX, 49,50). And there is a lesson for us in the fact that the disciples held fast to Thomas in spite of his disbelief in the Resurrection until he too was convinced.

This does not mean that there are not limits to such fellowship. There assuredly are. But even so, the evangelical faith cannot be separated from the evangelical spirit and those who hold the faith must display the spirit, even to those who do not hold it. And the question at issue is not as to the inclusion of non-evangelical opinions or persons in the Presbyterian Church but what shall our attitude be toward those who sincerely hold the confession and the basic standard of the Scriptures and who are members of our own household. The tradition and the law, the spirit and the constitution of our Church forbid the attitude of suspicion and schism toward such brethren.

Let one thing be stated with clear words. My only disagreement with Dr. Machen is at those points where, as it seems to me, he deviates from the teaching and the practice of the New Testament. If he will show me where I deviate from its teaching (as in its practice I know I do, alas how far,) I shall be grateful to him.

VII. "Modernism in China."

All that Dr. Machen has to say on this subject is comprised in two long statements, one by Dr. Albert B. Dodd, a missionary of the Board in China, and the other by Arie Kok, a member of the Netherlands Legation in Peiping. The former dealt wholly with books published in China, not by the Board or its missionaries, but by the Christian Literature Society. The only connection of the Board with this Society, whose spirit and service is in no sense fairly represented by Dr. Dodd's statement, is in its lending two of its missionaries to work with the Society. Dr. Watson M. Hayes also is one of its "associate workers." Not a word is said by Dr. Dodd about their contributions or about a single book written by a Presbyterian missionary. I have a letter from Dr. Dodd sending the material quoted by Dr. Machen. In this letter while asking that his representation

of unsoundness in some missionaries should be accepted, Dr. Dodd adds: "I can only ask you to accept my testimony on my word of honor as a Christian gentleman as I have no written proof to offer; nor do I feel called upon without such proof to give names". Such a presentation is not admissible on any basis of equity or under the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Arie Kok's statement is full of errors. Its most relevant charge is that the Board is cooperating through its missions in the National Christian Council and the Church of Christ in China and that it is supporting "modernist" theological schools in Yenching and Cheeloo Universities. The functions of the Missions of our Church on the foreign field and our relation to the Church of Christ in China, have been determined by our Church itself through the General Assembly and while the Christian agencies ^{of China} may do things we may not approve and may publish statements, as they have done, which we deplore, they are seeking as earnestly as any one can to know and do the will of Christ. ^{in China} As to the two theological schools, the missions of the Board are contributing neither money, nor missionaries, nor students to these schools at this time, except a Chinese teacher at Cheeloo.

I have dealt with the main positions of Dr. Machen's pamphlet.

One wishes that all the work of our Church at home and abroad, in every congregation and college and theological seminary, were more passionately evangelical and evangelistic both in faith and in practice, in word and in deed. But one dares to say that the best and truest part of it is in the work of the foreign missionaries, and that they and the cause they represent ought not to be used for purposes of doctrinal controversy in the home Church. That is what Dr. Machen is now doing - using the foreign mission work of our Church, in which he is not a stock holder and to which he advises people not to contribute, as a device for renewing strife and raising issues which constitutionally should be settled as doctrinal issues in accordance with the Constitution of the Church.

January 21, 1933

The Rev. Robert R. Littell, D.D.,
Tioga Presbyterian Church,
Tioga Avenue and 16th Street,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Littell:

Inasmuch as Drs. Speer and McAfee are on the point of leaving for a Zoning Campaign in the Middle West, they have handed me your recent letters to them with the copy of the Rev. Mr. Monsma's Report to the Presbytery of Philadelphia with the suggestion that I write you some comments thereon which might be helpful to you. Please understand that this is a purely personal expression of my own individual opinion and that no one else, least of all the Board itself, has any responsibility for what I now write.

One can hardly believe that the name "A Report...on the Foreign Missionary Situation..." is justified for this paper which is simply a confused collection of a lot of adverse criticisms of diverse kinds which recurrently push forward from their lonely isolation, emanating largely from certain missionaries that are temperamentally hyper-critical or that have something of a personal nature to promote or that have a grudge against someone (probably their own Mission which overruled them) or that are constitutionally "bad losers" when they are not supported by the majority in the democratic, representative government obtaining in our Presbyterian denomination abroad as well as at home. One is greatly gratified that a minute examination with a fine tooth comb in the hands of a keen critic can find relatively so little that is open to criticism among the thousands and thousands of enterprises, institutions, activities, relationships, pronouncements, reports, speeches, etc. over a period of years of the many diverse personalities that constitute the Board of Foreign Missions, its Executive Officers and its great body of missionaries drawn from all sections of our Church and at work in 16 different countries overseas, including also thousands of National Christian workers in those lands. When the criticisms of the "Report" have subtracted from them those that are mistaken, unjustifiable or misleading, there remains only an exceptionally small residuum that calls for continued corrective effort by the Board and the Missions. To have a work as large, as comprehensive, as complex and as far flung as our Presbyterian missionary enterprise with so few things that the most exacting critics can suggest for reform is to me remarkable.

Turning to the "Report," I venture to make some brief comments which may possibly help you on a number of items:

Page 1, bottom:- "Modernism has fastened itself with a vise-like grip upon our missionary organization as a whole"; that statement seems to be the initial thesis which the "Report" starts out to prove; it is certainly not the conclusion to which a reader is logically led, even assuming the full validity of the many erroneous statements and part-truths presented in the argument.

Page 3, middle ff:- "Our Candidate Secretary" assures me that he has not at any time expressed disbelief in any of the doctrines of our Church, As I

understand the Auburn Affirmation, it does not deal directly with theological doctrine. He is not "the man who passes upon the qualifications of a missionary" but only one of a large number of men and women of the Executive Council and of the Board's Candidate Committee, who reviews very carefully the qualifications of each candidate. Our Candidate Secretary is, I believe from every point of view, as fine a person as could be secured for this work. Our Missions on the field urge the Board to send only such new missionaries as are temperamentally constituted for constructive Christian cooperation with their fellow missionaries and with other evangelical Christians with whom it is inevitable that they will be associated in some way or other. Our application blank, the result of decades of experience, says, "Harmonious team work is indispensable." This is an added qualification which is a clear plus to sound doctrinal beliefs which are primary and required in every appointee. This question of team work has to do chiefly with cooperation with our own Presbyterian missionaries; within the past year, I recall the issue being raised with two candidates going to areas where there is no other denomination at work.

Page 3, bottom: That "the Leaders of the National Churches in the Far East are largely modernist in their principles and beliefs" is news to me. I know many of them personally. Such a charge should be substantiated in full or retracted, confining the evidence to specified leaders in the National Churches with which our own Missions cooperate.

Page 4: Exception is taken to "a letter" written jointly by our two Candidate Secretaries to the many hundreds of applicants. Enclosed herewith are two copies of that letter, which taken as a whole, gives a radically different impression from the brief extract misleadingly exhibited in the "Report". This criticism of Candidate Secretaries on the basis of one sentence wrenched out of its context seems rather characteristic of the methodology of the whole "Report" and so impairs its reliability.

Pages 4-5: Certain "candidates" are mentioned by name: Mr. Welbon was far short of meeting the requirements. His scholarship was poor, as was also his ability to make effective contacts; he had spent a year in Korea and the Korea Mission did not request his appointment; the Mission knew him well and would surely have asked for him if they wanted him. (In fact Korea missionaries wrote to the Board against his appointment.) A person who has lived within the bounds of a Mission is appointed by the Board only if the Mission within whose bounds he has lived approves such appointment. Furthermore, his friends rated him very low in intellectual ability, capacity for mental growth, resourcefulness, common sense, etc. Of "his stern orthodoxy" (the alleged basis of his refusal by the Board) I never heard until I saw it mentioned in this "Report". A successful Christian missionary really needs more than merely "stern orthodoxy."

Mr. King: There was no question at all regarding his theology; as he was thoroughly sound in the faith, this question never arose in the discussions. As reported by his professors and his fellow-students, he was admittedly a crank, markedly critical, and decidedly lacking in tact, and lacking a well-balanced life, physically, culturally and socially. As one very conservative referee put it, "He did not have a message - so far as his life expressed that message." When special money was raised to pay his salary for three years, the Board with some misgivings appointed him. Mr. King wrote that, because of his family situation, he was not able to carry through his agreement to go to the field and he asked to have his appointment cancelled.

Mr. Coray's application reached the Board so late in the year that the appropriation for new missionaries had already been exhausted. Furthermore, there was no opportunity for him and his fiancée to have the customary contacts with the Board and its Officers and to attend the new missionaries' conference all of which were thought to be unusually important in this case because Mr. Coray's early associations had been in the Christian and Missionary Alliance and his fiancée's experience had been

I believe, entirely in the Methodist Church. Moreover, it was thought it would be well for Mr. Coray to have some experience in Presbyterian work in the U.S.A. for contact with Presbytery, Presbyterian ministers, etc. before going abroad. Mr. Coray was assured that the Board would be very glad to consider his application later, after he had secured a year or two of such experience, "with the hope that an appointment might be made at that time." Mr. Coray's letter in reply was very appreciative of the Board's courteous attention and helpful advice; he is now a Presbyterian pastor at West Pittston, Pennsylvania. Certainly these reasons are not "specious in the extreme." If the writer of the alleged "Report" did not know them, he could readily have learned them prior to making public his unfounded charges.

Miss Hendricks: Her conversation with Mrs. McAfee is recalled very clearly by the latter, who asked if Miss Hendricks could work with people with whom she differed. Miss Hendricks replied that she did so with great difficulty, whereupon she was advised to give careful thought to this because she should not be a trouble maker or a divisive spirit on the field. The conversation was of a most friendly nature. I am reliably informed that, in the conversation, there was not (as mistakenly alleged) any reference whatever to "the Virgin Birth." (Moreover, Mrs. McAfee has no official relationship with the foreign missionary enterprise. In any letter directed to the writer of the "Report" it is suggested that the reference to her be deleted.)

Mr. Kerns (not Keans): While Mr. Kerns's application was in the process of consideration (having been approved by the Executive officers as preliminary to Committee consideration) the Board's Candidate Committee learned indirectly and for the first time that there was some question in the Washington Presbytery regarding his doctrinal beliefs; his application was at once arrested without approval of any kind either by the Board or by its Candidate Committee which makes all recommendations on appointments. On December 14, 1931 Washington Presbytery licensed Mr. Kerns. After that, on December 21, the Candidate Committee recommended and the Board approved his application and made the appointment, conditioned explicitly upon "thorough and hearty endorsement by the Presbytery for ordination and the action of ordination itself." The Presbytery later reported to the Board that its final action was "unanimous and hearty." In other words, as soon as it was learned here that there was a question in Presbytery regarding him, progress toward appointment was immediately stopped by the Board's Candidate Committee, and not begun again until after Presbytery passed him unanimously. Furthermore, the Presbytery unanimously recommended him to the Board as a foreign missionary. Mr. Kerns is doing effective and acceptable work in Guatemala; the "Guatemala News" refers with gratification to Mr. and Mrs. Kerns's very beautiful Christian spirit and sound evangelical faith.

Mrs. Buck: Separately you will receive a copy of a letter and a statement regarding Mrs. Buck that I had already written to Dr. Herrick in response to his request.

Page 5, middle: The Appraisal by the Laymen's Inquiry. "The Board tried to give the impression as though it made light of the thing," is alleged by the "Report." It certainly did not. You personally know how very deeply the Board felt and feels the opposite way. The preliminary statement of the Board (from which quotation is made) was issued about a fortnight before the Report was officially and formally released and explained to the Boards, that is, during the period when the Boards were asked to keep it confidential and not make public rejoinder. This preliminary statement by the Board was put out in an attempt to quiet some of the fears in the Church that had been raised by the violently disturbing publicity "Releases," at the same time playing fair with the request for confidence made of the Boards by the Inquiry. The Board was in a bad dilemma. The "Report" represents unfairly the Board's relationship to the Appraisal Commission. However it is quite true that when the Board previously presented "The Inquiry" to the General Assembly, the Board did cherish good hope regarding its con-

structive helpfulness but has been deeply disappointed. Of the Board's attitude and actions about the Appraisal Report, you are thoroughly familiar.

Page 6, bottom ff: The entire action on "Church Unionism" misrepresents the Board sharply. The implication is utterly un-Presbyterian that any group here in America would have the right or duty to reach across the sea and control the actions of a body of Christian believers who were seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Committee could challenge the source of information, asking for the names of those who have written and for the data used. Inquiry could be made of official, representative groups in these same areas from which private criticism came.

Page 7, bottom: Reference is made to the "Articles of faith of the Church of Christ in China." The writer of the "Report" understands why these preliminary Articles are "brief"; he also must know many "conscientious evangelicals" of our Presbyterian group who have accepted them and he also knows the full, frank doctrinal statement which the Church of Christ in China published as an informal expression of their common Christian belief. The formal, longer doctrinal statement is to be deferred for a while until the newly organized Church develops an integration and a feeling of unity of all the small and widely scattered evangelical groups which are entering it. The "Report" gives only a minor, and by itself a misleading part of what the Reporter knows of this matter; we placed full data in his hands many weeks ago. I attended the Second Triennial General Assembly of the Church of Christ in China and can testify that we American Presbyterians can be very grateful that the Christian Missions in China have developed such earnest, devoted Christian leadership for the small but growing body of national Christians in China.

Page 8, middle: Educational institutions and policies. Of the "Joint Committee on Leadership training" I can find no information; our Board certainly has no official relation to it nor any representative on it. Our General Assembly has many times recognized the "International Council of Religious Education" with which our own Presbyterian Board of Christian Education is officially connected.

Page 9, middle: Mixed faculties have long troubled the Board which makes constant and persistent effort to secure full Christian faculties which, in a few countries, are practically impossible as yet to secure. A university must have certain courses, say in literature, and there is no Christian (or not enough Christians) as yet qualified to present them. It is always understood that a non-Christian will be employed only when there is no qualified Christian available and that any such non-Christian shall be in sympathy with the definite Christian purpose and program of the institution. In union institutions statements to this effect are very frankly and explicitly included in their Constitutions, and a non-Christian teacher can be engaged only on the conditions above stated and then by formal, special vote by the Directors on the field and by the Board of Trustees in the United States. Steady progress toward all Christian faculties is being made and the Board and Missions will keep pressing along this line for constant improvement. As to the non-Christians in the student body, they constitute a splendid field for evangelism among educated groups of other religions. Such student evangelism is an avowed purpose in each and every institution with which our Board is willing to cooperate; evangelism is a primary purpose of educational work as published in the Board's Manual.

Page 10: Our Board is not, as far as I know, connected with schools in which "no religion shall be taught." It is true that in China religious worship and instruction cannot be required and our Board and Missions are protesting against this government regulation. In spite of this restriction, religious work in schools is going forward very successfully. Our missionaries report that the evangelistic and other religious work last year and during the present year have been as fruitful as before the restrictions were imposed. The enemies of Christianity would be very

happy to have Christian schools closed, as these schools are clearly the source of the powerful leadership of the Christian movement; but we must not play into the hands of the enemies of Christ. The Missions are taking every possible step to have the present regulations modified and in the meantime are carrying on very commendably in view of the many difficulties of all sorts. When schools can be no longer Christian in their character and influence, the Board will withdraw from them. The allegation that we "pour our money into institutions from which Christ has been excluded" is so unfounded as to be dumbfounding and calls for repudiation in the strongest language, or absolute proofs upon which the Board will instantly act.

Page 10, middle: "Our modernist missionaries have come to the Far East and said: 'the religion we come to bring you is not supernatural.'" I cannot believe that a single one of our missionaries ever in his worst nightmare made a remark like that! I certainly know of none that believe it. As this is a positive accusation of the most damaging sort, I think specifications with names and proofs should be demanded. Things like this have been broadcasted before about our missionaries, and when they have been run down there has been absolutely no proof that could be brought against any single one of them. To publish such a fallacy about "our" missionaries is a worse offense than heresy.

Pages 10-12: The National Christian Council of China is trying to do a greatly needed piece of work which is extremely difficult. Our Presbyterian General Assembly, U.S.A. has taken many actions, cooperating cordially with National Christian Councils in many Mission lands overseas. For the "Report" to say, on page 11, paragraph 2 that "the Council has constantly sought to stress the elimination of the supernatural in religious thought and practice" is so untrue as to be absurd! Its constant, strong and persistent pressure is in exactly the opposite direction and it is rendering a splendid service for the whole Christian movement throughout China. Our missionaries on the field, cooperating with the Council, are doing everything they can to lift its efficiency to the highest possible level as a vigorous evangelical agency of all the Chinese churches which participate. It is not perfect, (what is?) but it is the best cooperating enterprise of its kind that is possible in China today and is rendering formative, helpful service.

Pages 12-13: Our Church and Communism. To refer to the National Christian Council (presumably of China) as an ardent promoter of communism is beyond my comprehension. This is the first time I have ever heard of this charge (and as the Secretary for all our China Missions I hear and see lots of things, and I was in China two years ago). I do know that officers of that Council have been strongly censured for their opposition to communism; in fact, some of them once expressed their opposition in a way that caused Chinese communist sympathizers to try to have the government expel them from China for their political activity.

Page 13, middle: I do not believe that "our Presbyterian Board..lends official backing" to Dr. Sherwood Eddy and Kagawa; but to my mind many worse things could be done than aid Eddy in his virile, student evangelism and Kagawa in his sacrificial devotion to the doctrine that "God is love" which "the disciple whom Jesus loved" thought was orthodox. Eddy and Kagawa are making God and His Christ real and divinely redemptive and vitally reformatory to many individuals who become stalwart, fearless and effective and followers of their new-found Lord and Saviour.

Page 13, bottom: Is not the sharp distinction between the church as an organization for the individual and the church as an organism for the group a little too mechanistic? The first Deacons were officials of the organization in order to serve the organism "to alleviate social distress."

Page 14. Just why a city Y.M.C.A. in China is dragged into this picture is beyond me! Why not hold our Board of Education responsible for a moving picture shown

in the Y. at Palm Beach or Seattle? The Y.M.C.A. in Peiping did lease a hall to the movies; the movies abused the privilege and were ejected from the building. Nobody regretted the abuse more than the Y.M.C.A. itself which corrected it. I do not know of any relationship which our Missions or missionaries have with the Y.M.C.A. I told the writer of the "Report" that an occasional missionary in a private capacity might serve (I knew only one who did) on some Y.M.C.A. Committee just as Presbyterian elders in Philadelphia might serve. In either case the Presbyterian service would be constructive and Christian.

Page 15, middle of first paragraph: Any missionary who would "crucify Christ anew" should be named. This whole paragraph assumes unusual knowledge of the view-point and opinion of "the Judge in heaven." Certainly the assertions are not substantiated by the evidence adduced in the "Report."

Page 15, paragraph 2: If the overhead is compared with the total receipts of the Board, the result ^{is} fraction is somewhat less than one-sixth. Furthermore, much of this overhead goes to General Council to pay what the Board is assessed by General Assembly on account of General Council. The overhead is high and we are constantly working to reduce it; it is lower this year and will be further reduced next year. Board officers must spend much time in general denominational work of many kinds and yet Foreign Missions must carry this church overhead. Officers salaries should surely be kept low; but, when you include the cost of rents in New York City (and Secretaries must entertain many missionaries and others), I do not believe a Secretary and his family could function properly in New York on the proposed "\$4,000." Most, and perhaps all, officers of the Board supplement their salary from private resources. Whenever better officers can be secured for the same salary, or equally good officers for lower salaries, the present staff would hand over our jobs con amore; the great desire of our lives is to have Christian Missions carried forward as efficiently and as economically as possible. Dr. Simon Flexner says that a dollar goes farther in Foreign Mission Boards (at home and abroad) than anywhere else in the world.

After reading the self-styled "Report" I saw last night a junk shop filled with discarded what-nots from everywhere all polished up for sale. It reminded me of this "Report" which exhibits a queer jumble of unworthy criticisms gathered from the four winds. Most of it is so mistaken, so unjust, so nebulous and so misleading, both in its amazing statements and in its still more amazing omissions, that I fear that my hurriedly written, personal reactions will be of little service to you.

With warm personal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

George T. Scott

Copy to Dr. Cheesman A. Herrick

You will rejoice with us that the Board, even in this year, has been able to appoint a splendid group of young people. Sixty new missionaries have just attended the June Training Conference in New York, and by the end of the summer twenty-seven will be in China, nine in India, three in Africa, four in C'hosen, one in Japan, eight in Latin America, two in the Philippines, four in S'ima and four in Syria.

The group spent three days and a half in New York at the Board headquarters, studying the various relationships with the Board, the Home Church, and the Missions on the field. Then came six days at the Kennedy School of Missions at Hartford, Connecticut, in the Joint Conference for the new missionaries of nine different Boards. Here the general problems and subjects common to all groups were discussed. Two vital questions were raised and answers given. We pass on the questions:-

What do you know about Foreign Missions? What has been accomplished, how was it done, who has done it? These were answered in addresses, round table discussions and personal interviews.

The other question went to the heart of the whole enterprise. The opening address on "Spiritual Hunger and its Satisfaction" and the Round Table on "Sharing Christ as the Bread of Life", began the study of the significance and unique contribution of the Christian Enterprise. What is it we seek to share with other peoples and how do we share it?

How would you answer these questions? One candidate's reply to the first question was that he had not read a single book on Foreign Missions. How could he know that he wanted to be a missionary? He was not sent. This is China year in the Mission Study groups so we are enclosing the leaflet outlining the courses and another telling of our Presbyterian Missions in China. Why not organize a study group and begin your missionary work by sharing your enthusiasm with the group.

The second question of the Conference is:- What do we have to share? A student from India, speaking to a similar group of newly appointed missionaries said, "The first question my people will ask you who go to India is, 'Do you know God?' They will not need to put it into words, they will look at you and know". One missionary has said, "Send us missionaries who have real convictions and vital Christian experience, others will not stick, nor will they accomplish anything if they do."

In the busyness of your technical preparation, be sure not to neglect the one essential element in that preparation. Bible study, prayer, devotional books and some real experience in sharing Christ here will be for your spiritual preparation what your class-room lectures, theses and laboratory work are doing for your technical preparation. A study of the Bible by books or by topics such as "The Son of God"; "The Spread of Christianity"; "The Cross in the Bible" have been found helpful. Then there are books

like "The Devotional Diary" by Oldham; "Today"; an outline of Bible readings; "The Meaning of Faith" and others by Fosdick; "Marks of a World Christian" by Fleming. Some have used correspondence courses from the Biblical Seminary and other schools. What have you found helpful? Tell us and let us share it with others.

We are sending our greetings in this way to cover a thousand of you studying in Colleges, Seminaries, Medical and other Graduate Schools, as well as to some who are getting a year or two experience before sailing. Why not send us a suggestion as to what would be helpful in the next letter (six months hence). Our very best wishes go to you personally.

Very sincerely yours,

Sgd (Mrs.Charles H.)

Minnie W. Corbett

Lindsey S. B. Hadley
Candidate Secretaries

Spring letter, 1933.

Dear Friend:

The Report of the Laymen's Inquiry, which is now published under the title, "Re-Thinking Missions" is the book of the year in Mission thinking and planning. The Commission has challenged many details in the Mission work but their unanimous judgment as to the continuance of mission work is stated as follows:- "that these missions should go on, with whatever changes, we regard therefore, as beyond serious question." We are enclosing a copy of Dr. Speer's article "Re-Thinking Missions Examined" which deals with the critical questions raised by the report. Another leaflet, "Presbyterian Missions in the Light of Recent Studies" will be published soon, which we will gladly send to any who care to have it and will let us know.

Certainly two statements at least are of interest to all of you who are thinking of the possibility of mission service. The first is that "the history of Protestant Missions is a story of the influence of personality upon individuals and communities. The selection and preparation of missionaries is therefore the critical point of the entire enterprise, indeed it is not too much to say that upon the quality of personnel, far more than upon any other factor, or all other factors combined, depends the real and permanent success of the missionary enterprise."

Everything depends upon the clarity and thoroughness with which each individual can channel the Spirit of Christ and the love of God both in word and life. It is a tremendous task and we know how many of you are seeking, day by day new insight into His truth and new ways of fellowship with Christ which will make all this possible.

The second grows out of the first. In addition to the "power of a vivid personality", "spiritual excellence and gentle friendliness of their lives", the new missionaries should be capable of "thinking freshly and planning wisely" and meeting with creative minds, "the exacting missionary task of today." In addition to the thorough professional or technical training and a comprehensive and effective understanding of the Christian message, there should be a "thorough and impartial study of the history, art and religion of the country, its political, social and economic conditions and the psychology of the people."

Here is certainly a challenge to a mighty task and one for which hundreds of you students are preparing with all the earnestness and conviction which the report calls for.

Of course you will want to know how the Board is making out in this difficult year. We are planning to send out forty-five new missionaries this next summer. This is a real act of faith and, with the decrease in the ability of the church people to give this year, represents real conviction of the necessity for world planning in our Christian program. This number will not make our losses as we have an average net loss of about seventy-five to eighty missionaries, or 5% of our total force each year when we include retirements, deaths, and resignations because of health and other causes. There will be, therefore, a net loss of about thirty at the end of the year.

Spring Letter, 1933

We shall have to disappoint a good many who are making application for 1933 appointments, but on the other hand we rejoice that the Church is making it possible to send this many in response to a few of the urgent requests from the Missions abroad.

Several requests for suggestions of good books have been received. We are sending a few titles. If you want to read along any particular subject or country, just write us and we will furnish titles. If the books are not available locally, they can be secured from our Foreign Missions library by merely paying the postage.

"Christianity and the New World"	- Canon F. R. Barry
"A Faith that Rebels"	- David Cairns
"The Uncut Nerve of Missions"	- Cleland B. McAfee
"The Other Spanish Christ"	- John A. Mackay
"The Finality of Jesus Christ"	- Robert E. Speer
"A Daughter of the Narikin"	- Etsu Magaki Sugimoto
"At Work in India"	- Sir William Wanless, M.D.

We have heard from many of you since our last letter and we hope you will let us know of any way in which we can be of service. With every best wish for the year, we are,

Very sincerely yours,

(Mrs. Charles H.) Minnie W. Corbett

Lindsay S. G. Hadley
Candidate Secretaries.

Reply to

Dr. Machen's Address at the Presbytery of New Brunswick
at Trenton, N.J., April 11, 1933

A sympathetic report of this address appeared in "Christianity Today", Mid-April, 1933. The report is only partial and omits much that Dr. Machen said.

With the principle with which Dr. Machen began I am in full accord. It is the elemental principle of our standards, namely, that behind the Confession and the Catechisms are the Scriptures and that they are our final and absolute authority. "If the things that are being said and done by all these persons", said he, "are not in accord with the things written in this Book, then we must correct them in loyalty to Christ and the Gospel." Here is a common platform, here the judgment seat. But "all these persons" must include us all, the Church and the General Assembly, the Board and its missionaries, Dr. Machen and his associates - every one of us.

And it is precisely here that Dr. Machen's address filled one with amazement. He criticized the use of phrase after phrase found in the New Testament. "changed lives". (II Cor. III, 18, Rom. XII, 2, II Cor. V, 17; Eph. IV, 24); "the mind of Christ" (I Cor. II, 16; Phil. II, 5) "the teachings of Jesus" (Acts I., John XIV 26, Matt. XXVIII, 20) (John VI, 36, XV, 7) There surely is the gravest objection to the way these phrases may be used but that is no warrant for objecting to the use of the phrases or to the ideas that lie behind.

"The Mind of Christ" is Paul's phrase but Paul did not use the phrase as Dr. Machen interpreted it, and so far from identifying it with the possibility of hearing Christ speaking, as Dr. Machen did, he used it as indicating the kind of mind we should have today.

Dr. Machen also rejected the idea "that Christianity is a new religion over against Judaism". Let any one take his concordance and read the New Testament passages speaking of the newness of the Gospel; let him study the Epistle to the Hebrews; let him be grasped by Paul's gospel in Romans and Galatians and Ephesians and he will be dumbfounded by Dr. Machen's views.

Equally amazing were Dr. Machen's words about "Christ in us". It is indeed the Christ of the Bible whom we are to preach but the Bible sets forth not only the doctrine of Christ and the fact of Christ in history but the glorious truth of the indwelling Christ, Christ in us and we in Christ. (John XV, X; XIV, 17, Rom. VIII, 10; Gal. II, 20, IV, 19; Eph. III, 17; Gal. III, III; Rom. XII, 5; I. Cor. III, 1, II Cor. V, 17; Gal. III, 27). And that will be poor and unreal preaching of the Christ of the Bible which does not realize and experience and make others feel that the Christ preached is the real Christ of the Bible as set forth in these great and precious words.

Not less amazing was Dr. Machen's treatment of the New Testament teaching about the Kingdom of God and Paul's emphasis on God's wrath in His proclaiming the Gospel. It is not too much to say that he derided those who adhere strictly to the New Testament in both of these respects. He held that we are not to seek the Kingdom of God and its establishment now but must wait for it until Christ comes. Now the teaching of the New Testament about the Kingdom is not easy but Dr. Machen's presentation was in direct conflict with such passages as Matt. VI, 33; XII, 28; Mark 1, 14, 15; IX, 1; X, 14, 15; Luke VI, 20, VII, 21; John III, 5; Rom. XIV, 17; Matt. VI, 10; Matt. XIII, 38; Luke XXII, 29,

and many others. "Christianity Today" says that Dr. Machen is an "millennialist" a believer in no millennium, and that in his view Christ's Second coming is the end of the world. If there is no Kingdom of God on earth until Christ comes ~~and~~ no earth for there to be a Kingdom afterwards, then the New Testament is a wholly unworthy book.

As to Paul's presentation of the Gospel in terms of the wrath of God, it is solemnly true that Paul declared the ^{truth} wrath of God against all sin and that the true preaching of the Gospel must include the preaching of the wrath and the fear of God, and that our present easy-going, easy-thinking day sorely needs such preaching, but to represent Paul's Gospel as this alone, or even predominantly, is to misrepresent it. Not once did Dr. Machen mention the love of God. What was Paul's emphasis? He uses the phrase, "the wrath of God", three times (Rom. I,18, Eph. V. 6, and Col. III.6). He uses the phrase, "the love of God", five times (Rom. V.5, VIII. 39, II Cor. XIII.14, II Thess. III.5, Titus III.4). And if, passing by the phrases, one will note the times Paul speaks of love and the times he speaks of wrath, he will perceive that Paul's Gospel is a very different Gospel from the Gospel which Dr. Machen set forth at the Presbytery of New Brunswick. As one listened to Dr. Machen's doctrine of the Kingdom of God and of the Gospel of Christ as preached by Paul, he wondered whether Charles and Archibald Hodge and Francis Patton were not turning over in their graves.

There was one new and welcome note in this address. One wondered whether Dr. Machen was ready to join the pre-millennial company of those of us who wait always for the coming of Christ, who take literally the blessed promise of the New Testament, "that this same Jesus who was ~~literally~~ raised up for you into heaven shall so come in like manner" (Acts I,11) and who are looking every day "for the blessed hope and appearing for the great God and Saviour Jesus Christ". (Titus II, 13)

Other statements of Dr. Machen's address, whether reported in "Christianity Today" or omitted from that report, have been elsewhere dealt with in this pamphlet. There remain one minor matter and three major matters to be referred to.

Dr. Machen made much of the fact that a Committee of which I am Chairman representing the missionary boards at work in Latin America, had been implicated in making three of Dr. Fosdick's books available in Spanish. This Committee expended no money upon the publication of these books. Two of them, "The Manhood of the Master" and "The Meaning of Prayer" were published by the Methodist Book Concern and "The Meaning of Faith" by David Jarro of Madrid personally. I had nothing to do with the matter, but if I had I should have regarded it as no crime. I would make some changes in these books but, as they are, they have been of great blessing and help to many perplexed souls and to the cause of Christ in many lands.

The major matters are these three:

1. Dr. Machen's conception of evangelical Christianity which omits whole sections of the teaching of the New Testament and directly contradicts some of it. This is the gravest matter of all.

2. His departure from the Confession of Faith. He is unwilling to accept its language just as it stands, but insists on editing it by adding adjectives which

are not in the Confession and even whole assertions which are not found in it. He quotes a statement issued by the Candidate Department of the Board to help candidates, which said: "The Church has found during all its years that it can go to the Bible without hesitation or fear to learn its duty in faith and practice, finding its norm always in Jesus Christ who is its ultimate authority. The Bible can always be relied upon in these two vital fields and hence it is called the only infallible rule for this purpose. This does not deny the existence of truth in many places; it locates complete reliability in the Word of God." "This is the unquestionable position of the Constitution of our Church. But Dr. Machen says "This is wrong.....The Bible is a book of science and history" and he declared that as science and history it was infallibly true. Now whether the Bible is a book of science and history and infallible as such, as well as our infallible rule of faith and practice, such a doctrine is not found in the Confession of Faith. (Cf. A.A. Hodge, Popular Lectures, p. 92) Whatever our views on inspiration and inerrancy may be, we must allow room in our Church for all who abide literally by the view of the Confession and for men like Dr. Francis L. Patton, who wrote in "Fundamental Christianity":

"Conceding now the inspiration of Scripture, you cannot on that account assume that it is errorless. You may say that being inspired it is fair to expect that it will be preserved from error, but this is not evidence. We are accustomed in support of the inspiration of the Bible to cite its accuracy; inspired, let us say, because errorless. It is a different thing, however, to say errorless because inspired. To say that the Bible is trustworthy because of its accuracy is by implication to say that we have the right and power to discern between truth and error. You cannot license Reason to seek truth and deny her right to see error. And it is a hazardous thing to say that being inspired the Bible must be free from error; for then the discovery of a single error would destroy its inspiration. Nor have we any right to substitute the word 'inerrancy' for 'inspiration' in our discussion of the Bible unless we are prepared to show from the teaching of the Bible that inspiration means inerrancy - and that, I think, would be a difficult thing to do.

"This will serve to show how it is that some at the present day are saying that unless the Bible is without error it cannot be trusted for anything, and also how foolish such a statement is. Is there anything in all that is said about inspiration that can show us the exact area covered by inspiration and can tell us how far the mind of the Spirit and the mind of the author were coextensive in the writing of the Bible? Is there anything which assures us that Paul was as much under the influence of inspiration in sending for his cloak at Troas as in writing the Galatian Epistle? Then whatever you may think, however reasonable it is to suppose that the Spirit and Paul were concurrently active and in the same degree in all that Paul wrote, we cannot claim that this is explicitly stated or by fair inference logically deducible from anything said in the New Testament. With the deepest reverence for the Scripture as the inspired word of God, I am, nevertheless, bound to say that differences of opinion on this point must be allowed to exist, as they have always existed, among Christians."
(P.163 f.)

3. The third matter is the question of ^{respect} request for constitutional procedure and authority. As to procedure I have already spoken, but as to authority, is it right for men to appeal to courts whose jurisdictions and decisions they do not respect? Dr. Machen warned the New Brunswick Presbytery of its incompetency to resist imagined eloquence, and another Presbytery was warned by a friend of his not to hear evidence adverse to an overture similar to Dr. Machen's. When the New Brunswick Presbytery decided against him he sought to have his overture adopted in other Presbyteries where he himself had no standing. The same attitude has been taken toward the authority of the General Assembly more than once. And "Christianity Today", in its report of Dr. Machen's address, sets up the astonishing

doctrine that the citation of the actions of past Assemblies is wearisome and indeterminate as bearing on questions of policy and order, and that all that concerns us is what future Assemblies shall do. It is quite true that within the Constitution each Assembly acts for itself, but it is preposterous to propose that the Church has no history, no valid tradition, no established principles *but only such* ~~as~~ that may be abandoned or reversed any year, and that meanwhile may be ignored. However reckless or lawless individuals may be, the Boards and agencies of the Church are bound to carry out the determined policies of the Church. Does "Christianity Today" mean now to regard as inconsequential the actions and deliverances of all past Assemblies? Where did the Confession of Faith itself originate? That was a more ancient Assembly than any which I cited at the Presbytery of New Brunswick. And the adoption of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the standards of our Church was an act pure and simple of the Synod of 1729 which preceded and corresponded to our General Assembly. If the actions of past Assemblies are of no authority or consequence but only the actions of future assemblies what becomes of our own standards and will not the Assembly of 1933, to which "Christianity Today" looks forward to reverse past Assemblies be itself only another negligible past Assembly in a few months? What would Charles Hodge say about such lawlessness? (Cf. His "History of the Presbyterian Church. Chapter I. page 92, 123 f.) I know full well that "one Assembly is not bound by the acts of another", but I know, too, that there are limits to such independence and that the constitutional decisions of our Assembly stand until constitutionally reversed. I doubt the right of men to appeal to the General Assembly who regard so lightly the judgment of the Court to which they appeal and also their right to defy, as Dr. Machen has done, that our Church and General Assembly are evangelical and yet to make appeal to them to determine evangelical loyalty. Dr. Machen has said that he does not accept the General Assembly's expression of confidence in the Foreign Board. What moral right does he have therefore, to appeal to it for the expression of its lack of confidence? Men cannot play fast and loose with the highest court of the Church in this way.

In these three respects - attitude to the Bible, attitude to the Confession of Faith, and attitude to our government and polity, Dr. Machen's statement at the New Brunswick Presbytery was not true Presbyterianism.

And yet one concluding word. The Presbyterian Church has two marks, narrowness and breadth, the narrowness and breadth of what it believes to be the truth. There is room in it for Dr. Machen and his view and there is room also for others whose views and attitudes differ from his but who stand also upon our confessional standards and within our Constitutional liberties. No one group may exclude the others or claim sole legitimacy, provided we accept and obey the Constitution which includes also the Standards. And such acceptance and obedience, if called in question are not left to individuals to pronounce judgment upon but are to be determined by the processes of our law.

It follows that the agencies of the Church should be amenable to and representative of the Church, its Constitution, its tradition, its spirit, its complete membership.

A Statement by Mr. Robert E. Speer
to the Presbytery of New Brunswick at its meeting in
Trenton, N.J., April 11, 1933.

Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren:

I am not here to engage in any debate or controversy. I am glad to have come in response to the invitation of the Presbytery courteously supported by Dr. Erdman, Dr. Machen and other members of the Presbytery, to be of whatever help I can to the Presbytery as it seeks to deal wisely and justly with the proposed overture presented to it at its meeting on January 24, 1933, and laid over for action at this meeting today. The simple question is, what action is just and right, for the good of Christ's Church and in accord with the Mind of Christ? My only desire is to try to be of help to the Presbytery in finding and following that Mind.

In order not to be drawn into any controversy and to avoid the temptation of answering any argument that might be made here today in behalf of the proposed overture, I have written out in advance this statement of fact and constitutional principle dealing first with the precise terms of the proposed overture presented by Dr. Machen and then with the general attitude and method of procedure which it represents.

The issues involved are not new. They have been passed upon authoritatively by the General Assembly and they have been discussed at length in correspondence with Dr. Machen in preceding years, beginning in 1926, and especially in 1929 in very extensive communications. They are now presented in the proposed overture to the General Assembly in four sections which should be dealt with carefully and fairly one by one.

I. The first section is that the General Assembly be asked

"To take care to elect to positions on the Board of Foreign Missions only persons who are fully aware of the danger in which the Church stands and who are determined to insist upon such verities as the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth of our Lord, His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice, His bodily resurrection and His miracles, as being essential to the Word of God and our Standards and as being necessary to the message which every missionary under our Church shall proclaim."

With regard to this proposal four things are to be said:

1. It is unfairly discriminatory. It singles out one of the four Boards of the Church and asks for distinctive action of the General Assembly with regard to it alone. These four Boards stand on precisely the same constitutional basis and sustain to the Assembly

and the Church the same constitutional relationship. It would be unjust and unfair for the Presbytery to ask the General Assembly to act in a discriminatory way with regard to any Board of the Church in a matter of exactly equal applicability and relevance to them all.

2. It rests on implications, assumptions and suspicions which are unfounded and which are especially unfair and unjust at this present time when the Board of Foreign Missions has shown itself to be, and has been gratefully acknowledged in all denominations and all over the world as being the bulwark of our evangelical faith and of the unflinching affirmation of the supernatural gospel of the New Testament as against the theology of the Report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry.

3. The first clause of this section proposes a calculation of wholly dubious significance and of impossible determination. It asks the General Assembly "to take care to elect to positions on the Board of Foreign Missions only persons who are fully aware of the danger in which the Church stands." It does not define what the "danger" is or what is the proof of "awareness" or how it is to be determined whether any particular individual is "fully" or only partially aware. There are many different dangers and many different ways of displaying one's attitude toward them and many different judgments as to the best way of meeting them. The proposition here expressed is neither clear nor competent.

4. The remainder of this section embodies identically the principle of two overtures which were fully debated and authoritatively determined by the General Assembly of 1924 at Grand Rapids of which Dr. Macartney was Moderator and Dr. Machen a member. One of these overtures was from the Philadelphia Presbytery and proposed for application to all the Theological Seminaries, the General Council, the Boards and every other agency of the Church, the principle which is here proposed again. The other overture to the same effect, but limited to the Board of Foreign Missions, was sent up by the Presbytery of Seattle. The first of these was dealt with by the Judicial Commission which presented a full judgment closing with these words - "It is therefore the judgment of the Judicial Commission that the overture in question proposes action by the General Assembly which would impose doctrinal tests upon ministers and elders which are unconstitutional, and for this reason no action should be taken thereon by this General Assembly and it is so recommended." This judgment was confirmed by the Assembly. The other overture was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, of which Dr. Maitland Alexander was Chairman, and the Committee reported advising that no action be taken and the Assembly so ordered. The overture now before the Presbytery of New Brunswick proposes, therefore, what the General Assembly of 1924, by two separate actions, disallowed.

II. The second section is that the General Assembly be asked:

"To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions that no one who denies the absolute necessity of acceptance of such verities by every candidate for the ministry

can possibly be regarded as competent to occupy the position of Candidate Secretary."

The present Candidate Secretary of the Board to whom this proposal evidently refers was for six years a missionary of our Church in North China. In his ordination vows he answered the constitutional questions in the affirmative and he answers them so now. He was obliged by threatened tuberculosis to return to America and worked for three years as a home missionary in the Southern mountains. In pursuance of its policy to have a young man as Candidate Secretary, not too far removed from the young men and women of the colleges and seminaries, the Board called him to this service in 1926. He has since rendered most efficient and devoted service in this capacity and as a speaker among the churches. He does not select or appoint missionaries. All candidates are passed upon by a special committee of the Board as well as by the full Executive Council of the Board and all appointments are made directly by the Board itself.

With regard to the Candidate Secretary personally it is to be said that he is an ordained minister in full and regular standing in one of the Presbyteries of our General Assembly and that the only appropriate and constitutional method of impugning his standing in the Church is by the process prescribed by our form of Government. Any other method is explicitly disapproved by our Constitution and by the actions of the General Assembly. The question that is raised here is not the question of the proper qualifications of foreign missionaries. We will come to that in a moment. What is involved here by indirection is the very principle passed upon by the General Assembly of 1924.

The Candidate Secretary, Mr. Hadley, knew of my coming here today and of the overture proposed to the Presbytery and of his own accord he wrote me a letter from which I quote these words:

"There has never been any suggestion of compromise as to the Evangelical basis of judgment of our missionary candidates. The responsibility for the Ministerial group rests with the Presbyteries. The Executive Council and the Candidate Committee of the Board have exercised the greatest care in seeking a vital evangelical faith and conviction on the part of every new missionary appointed, as you can testify.

"As for my own position I am sure you know that I am a conservative in theology. In my ordination vows before the Presbytery of Geneva in 1908 I affirmed my belief in the Scriptures as the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice; in Jesus Christ as the Eternal Son of God who became flesh and dwelt among us; that He was born of the Virgin Mary, died for our sins according to the Scriptures; rose from the dead on the third day; ascended to Heaven and ever liveth to make intercession for us.

"I have never departed from this position nor from my conviction that it is the only real motive for, and foundation of our great missionary work at home and abroad."

The ultimate purpose which all of us must have in view is the securing of an adequate body of true missionaries, men and women who truly believe and truly live the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour as set forth in the Standards of our Church. But how shall these qualifications, doctrinal or otherwise, be determined and where, if questions arise, does the authority and responsibility reside for their decision. The law of our Church and the repeated actions of the General Assembly answer these inquiries clearly:

Moore's Presbyterian Digest 1878, p. 659. "Boards have no authority to sit in judgment on Ministers:"

"a. In answer to the questions propounded by the Presbyteries of Union and French Broad, the Assembly would say, that though they do not recognize in the Board of Missions the authority to sit in judgment upon the orthodoxy or morality of any minister who is in good standing in his own Presbytery, yet, from the necessity of the case, they must exercise their own sound discretion upon the expediency or in expediency of appointing or withholding an appointment from an applicant, holding themselves amenable to the General Assembly for all their official acts. 1830, p. 290."

"b. In all questions touching ... the character of ministers, the Board of Home Missions, in cases of difference between itself and the Presbytery, should abide by the final judgment of the Presbytery. 1883, p. 644."

Repeated Assembly action have declared this to be the law of the Church. See Minutes 1837, 1856, 1869, 1882. See Hodge's "What is Presbyterian Law," pp. 116, 233, 413, 427.

As far as I remember this issue arose first in the experience of the Board of Foreign Missions, in 1893 in connection with a very difficult case and the Board, under the leadership of Dr. William M. Paxton and Dr. Robert Russell Booth, took the following action:

"The Board has but one rule in reference to cases involving doctrinal or ecclesiastical questions: namely, to refer them to the Presbytery to which the missionary concerned belongs. In the only similar case which has occurred in the last twenty years, the question of the doctrinal views of the missionary concerned was simply referred to his Presbytery. This rule should exempt the Board from all difficulties and discussions in such matters. It regards its function as that of an Executive Body charged with the propagation of the Gospel under the direction of the General Assembly, its missionaries being subject to their Presbyteries in all doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters."

In 1902 the question emerged again and Dr. Paxton set down in writing the views which he held, as follows:

"The General Assembly has committed the choice of ministers for the missionary field into the hands of the Presbytery and our Board of Foreign Missions. It assigns to each body its own special work. The Board of Missions is, first, to investigate the piety; second, health; third, the aptitude of the applicant.

"The Presbytery is charged with the work of investigating, first, the piety (this being so important it is given to both bodies); second, the scholarly attainments; and thirdly, the orthodoxy of the applicant.

"Each of these bodies has its own work, and the order in which it is to be done has been settled by custom. First, the student indicates to the Board of Foreign Missions his desire to be appointed as a missionary; the Board should then perform its work of examining into his health, his piety and his aptitude. This done, they should report to the Presbytery the name of the student, the result of their investigations and their recommendation to the Presbytery to proceed with its work in examining and endorsing the student. If this is satisfactory, they should report to the Board that they are satisfied, and that the way is clear to proceed with the applicant's appointment. This completes all the preparations, and the ordination can be completed at some future time.

"This will make the steps perfectly clear, and prevent any complication between the Board and the Presbytery. It will, at the same time free the applicant from any anxieties of mind, which I have known sometimes to affect the health of the student seriously.

"I have often felt anxious about our students who had given in their names as candidates, and become very discouraged by the long delay between the action of the Board and the Presbytery.

"This plan also will readily discover any theological deficiency or error in the student; and it will only make anxious the minds of those who are conscious of false opinions, whilst orthodox men will have no anxiety whatever about their acceptance.

"It seems to me that if this plan, as originally intended, is carried out, there need be no conflict whatever between the Board and the Presbytery."

This view was adopted by the Board and approved by the General Assembly of 1903 and again by the General Assembly of 1905 in the following explicit action:

"On the clear understanding that the phrase 'general fitness' includes those matters lying on the borderland of doctrinal belief which, while not affecting doctrinal soundness and therefore not ordinarily coming within the scope of Presbyterial inquiry, may seriously affect a man's fitness for the foreign field, we approve the Board's declaration of policy and methods as to the theological qualifications of missionaries, which is as follows: 'The Board reaffirms its adherence to the

principle set forth in its action of May 6, 1902, that it has no ecclesiastical functions, and that all questions relating to ministerial standing or soundness in the faith must be authoritatively and finally settled by the Church courts. Accordingly in any case where evidence is brought before the Board tending to show a doctrinal unsoundness on the part of a ministerial appointee or candidate, it shall be promptly referred for investigation to the Presbytery to which he is responsible. The Board, however, while affirming the principle of the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Church in matters of orthodoxy, does not consider itself precluded thereby from reconsidering at any time the general fitness of an appointee for the arduous and responsible service of the foreign missionary, and of assuring itself by proper and reasonable inquiries of his probable usefulness in the field. The Board directs that this action shall be especially reported to the next General Assembly for approval, modification or reversal."

The Board has sought to act with the most conscientious care in this matter. In the case of all unordained missionaries who are not passed upon by the Presbyteries it asks the essential questions itself and seeks help from pastors and church sessions. In the case of ordained men it does not take its responsibility in any perfunctory way but seeks carefully and faithfully to secure a body of godly and devoted men who are well grounded in the great fundamental convictions of the standards of our Church and who will preach the full, glorious Gospel of the New Testament. And the Board would retain no Candidate Secretary who did not represent its mind and the mind of the Church in this regard.

III. The third section of the proposed overture is that the Assembly be asked

"To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions to take care lest, by the wording of the application blanks for information from candidates and from those who are asked to express opinions about them, or in any other way, the impression be produced that tolerance of opposing views or ability to progress in spiritual truth, or the like, is more important than an unanswering faithfulness in the proclamation of the gospel as it is contained in the word of God and an utter unwillingness to make common cause with any other gospel whether it goes under the name of Christ or not."

I have brought with me a full set of blanks now used by the Board in the selection of the missionary candidates and they are here for the examination of the Presbytery. I will quote all the questions in them relevant to this section of the proposed overture:

1. What does Jesus Christ mean to you personally?
2. What place and meaning has prayer in your life?

6. What is your attitude toward the statement that the supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make Jesus Christ known to all men as their Saviour and Lord?
8. What is your attitude toward the view that missionaries frankly and without apology should seek to persuade men to become disciples of Jesus?
12. What would be your general method of approach to the adherents of other religions?
29. From your experience how easy have you found it to accept and help to carry out the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions?
30. What, if any, reservations have you with regard to leaving the decision as to the type and location of your work to the local Mission authorities?
32. What reservations would you have in complying with a request to give up personal habits which might be felt to lessen your influence on the mission field (with the general community, Christian community, fellow missionaries)?
33. Please write on the separate sheet provided herewith, a statement giving (a) a brief sketch of your life; (b) your Christian experience and religious development; (c) your motives in seeking missionary appointment; (d) the content of your Christian message. (This statement must accompany your application blank).

Also on a separate blank:

29. What Bible training have you had?
45. What do you personally think of Jesus?
46. In what ways have you helped others to a personal commitment to Jesus Christ?
47. What is your practice in personal prayer?
48. Describe your use of the Bible for devotional reading?

As to the content of the candidate's Christian message the candidate is advised that - "This question is vital. You propose to go to a foreign land in order to propagate the Christian religion, either by public address or by personal contacts, or by both. It is of the utmost importance that you should have a clear idea of what this religion is. Any positive statements upon Christian faith and practice which you wish to make should be set forth here, and will naturally include your idea of God, Jesus Christ, the redemptive work of Christianity, duties to your fellow men, the Bible, the Church, together with such other leading truths as you would expect to embody in your message. Such condensation is desired as may be consistent with a satisfactory setting forth of your views."

As you will observe there are no questions here or elsewhere in these blanks conveying the impression or justifying the implications of the overture. Dr. Machen has in mind blanks used in the past on which for years and years was the following question: "Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary

to your opinions?" and the questions still asked of the references given by the candidate with regard to the candidate's "Christian character, vital religious experience, spiritual influence on others, desire to progress in spiritual truth and eagerness for Christian service." Surely there is no warrant in these natural and proper questions for the implications of the overture. They suggest nothing more than is again and again enjoined in the New Testament.

Perhaps it will help you to enter the joyous reality of this glorious enterprise and its Christian worthfulness and unity to have some of the statements which missionary candidates present. I have brought four or five of these, not picked out for the purpose but actually the first ones in order which came to my desk after the receipt of the Presbytery's invitation, and shall be glad to read them to the Presbytery, as showing the type of candidate applying to the Board.

IV. The fourth section of the proposed overture to the Assembly is as follows:

"To warn the Board of the great danger that lurks in union enterprises at home as well as abroad, in view of the widespread error in our day."

There are dangers in union enterprises, whether matrimonial, political or religious. But there are dangers outside of them as well. And there are times when the safety of union is greater than its dangers. None of us who know the joy of the perfect love which casts out fear give any reckoning to its dangers. In our national life no doubt there are dangers in the union of these states but there are vastly greater dangers in their disunion. I rejoice that my great-great-grandfather voted in the Pennsylvania Convention for the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and the creation of our nation in the face of the opposition of his constituents who feared the great dangers that lurked in the American union.

There are dangers in church union, and there are unions in which our Church and its Boards cannot join, but the principles and the policy of the Church are clear as daylight and have been for generations. The Constitution of the Church lays the ground for all true cooperation and union in its noble definition: "The Universal Church consists of all those persons, in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of Christ, and of submission to His laws" (Form of Government, Chapter II, par. 2). In 1887 in response to a communication from the Commission of Conference on Christian Unity of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the General Assembly took action (1) accepting "as clear presentations of the position of the Presbyterian Church on Church union and unity" two overtures from the Presbytery of New York and New Brunswick, the latter closing with the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a Committee of -- be appointed to confer with any similar Committees that may be appointed by other Christian Churches, which receive the Holy Scripture as the

infallible Word of God and look for salvation to Christ alone, to consider what measures are practicable to exhibit and promote the unity of the Church of Christ and to secure cooperation in efforts to advance the kingdom of our common Redeemer, and to report to the next General Assembly."

(2) accepting, in the same way, the following report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures; while overruling its recommendation that the Assembly decline to appoint a Committee to meet the Protestant Episcopal Commission,

"We recommend that the General Assembly express its cordial sympathy with the growing desire among evangelical Christian Churches, for practical unity and cooperation in the work of spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout all the earth.

"We also recommend that the General Assembly proclaim to the Christian world their statement of the principles whereby, in its judgment, practical Church unity can be realized and maintained.

1. All believers in Christ constitute one body; mystical, yet real, and destined to grow into the fulness of Him who filleth all in all.

2. The Universal Visible Church consist of all those throughout the world, who profess the true religion, together with their children.

3. Mutual recognition and reciprocity between the different bodies who profess the true religion, is the first and essential step toward practical Church unity."

(3) and officially replying to the Protestant Episcopal Church as follows:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, now in session at Omaha, Neb., have received with sincere gratification the 'declaration' of your House of Bishops; and your request under it for a brotherly conference with us and with other branches of the Church of Christ, 'seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.'

"The General Assembly are in cordial sympathy with the growing desire among the evangelical Christian Churches for practical unity and cooperation in the work of spreading the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ throughout all the earth; and they respond to your invitation with the sincere desire that the conference asked for may lead, if not to a formal oneness of organization, yet to such vital and essential unity of faith and spirit and cooperation as shall bring all the followers of our common Lord into hearty fellowship, and to mutual recognition and affection, and to ministerial reciprocity, in the branches of the one visible Church of Christ, working together with Him in advancing His kingdom upon earth."

This Committee on Church Unity thus established was the real beginning of the General Assembly's Department of Cooperation and Union.

This same Assembly urged the establishment of "independent national Churches holding to the Reformed doctrine and the Presbyterian polity on foreign fields," and urged the development of union Presbyteries and the dissolution of Presbyteries of "our Assembly as rapidly as this can wisely be done." (General Assembly Minutes 1887, pp. 23,24).

The General Assembly of 1905 took four distinct actions on the subject of union on the foreign field, sanctioning the union of our Church with three others in Korea and declaring generally -

"Very commendable are the courage and the high spirit of consecration manifest in many places already ripe for it, in a readiness to enter into proper union movements leading to the much desired development of native resources and organization, which the conditions of the times imperatively demand. We greatly rejoice in their spirit of Christian fellowship and cooperation. (General Assembly Minutes 1905, p.120)

"We also receive with great gratification the report of the Board's action concerning the Union Movement in Korea, which is formally endorsed in a subjoined recommendation. The logic of present day providences in Mission lands is leading inevitably toward national churches, as the best possible method of reaping the ripening harvest. It would surely be contrary to the spirit of Christ and New Testament precedent to build such national churches on the foundation of our own divisions, of whose occasions even we ourselves have been largely healed." (p. 121)

Other Assemblies went far beyond this in their deliverances with regard to organic union at home, but I will cite only a few of the declarations regarding cooperation and union abroad. In 1900 the General Assembly specifically approved the statement: "The object of the foreign missionary enterprise is not to perpetuate on the mission field the denominational distinctions of Christendom, but to build upon Scriptural lines, and according to Scriptural principles and methods, the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Where Church union cannot be attained, the Board and Missions will seek such divisions of territory as will leave as large districts as possible to the exclusive care and development of separate agencies. It is believed that in other regards, also, missionary comity should be given large range; (1) Salaries of native workers should be so adjusted among Missions as not to introduce an element of dissatisfaction among the workers of any Mission, or to tempt them away from the Mission with which they are connected. (2) Each Mission and the Churches connected therewith should recognize the acts of discipline of other Missions and the churches connected with them. (3) In cooperative educational work, and especially where the schools of one Mission train helpers for other Missions, the latter should render some compensatory service. (4) Printing establishments are in many

Missions required by the missionary work. Such should not be unnecessarily duplicated. The printing establishment of one Mission should, if possible, be made to serve the needs of all others in the same territory. (5) A hospital invariably opens wide opportunities for evangelistic work. Until these are properly utilized, or it is not judicious or economical to establish other hospitals, the results of whose establishment will be to multiply further unutilized spiritual opportunities. (6) Fellowship and union among native Christians of whatever name should be encouraged in every possible way, with a view to that unity of all disciples for which our Lord prayed, and to which all mission effort should contribute."

In 1905 the Assembly 'noted with satisfaction the readiness of the Board to give cordial response to appeals from the Mission stations for endorsement of reasonable union movements properly conserving essential truths.'"

In 1914 the Report of the Committee on Christian Cooperation and Union which was adopted by the Assembly noted as worthy of special mention that "the Christian workers in the foreign field are far in advance of those in the home field in the realization of unity and of cooperation." (Minutes 1914, p.27)

In 1916 it was voted "that the Assembly reiterate its hearty approval of the Board's policy to promote comity, cooperation and union in all practicable ways, thus avoiding denominational overlapping and the undue multiplication of agencies in a given field, but using men and money to the best advantage."

In 1924 the whole question of cooperation and union on the Mission field was thoroughly discussed by the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, under the chairmanship of Dr. MacLennan and with the advice of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, and the Committee unanimously recommended and the Assembly unanimously voted that "the policy established by past General Assemblies, in repeated enactments with regard to cooperation with other Evangelical bodies in our Foreign Mission work" should be "loyally maintained", adding the provision, wholly acceptable to the Board and in full accord with its principles and policy, "that the Board be directed to exercise due care with regard to the Evangelical character of all such union and cooperative enterprises, and if there should arise in the work of these enterprises a situation in which teachings unsound or injurious to the Evangelical Faith are given, the Board, as it has declared to be its policy, should either secure the correction of such a situation or failing should withdraw from further participation."

The proposed overture mentions one set of dangers. There is another set. From both of these our Church and its Boards should hold aloof. There are the dangers of union with unevangelical forces. And there is the danger of disunion among men and women of a true common evangelical faith and love.

I have tried to deal fairly with the terms of the proposed overture. I believe that both in form and in content it contravenes the Constitution and traditions of our Church, and that the Presbytery

of New Brunswick should not transmit it to the General Assembly. But I welcome this opportunity to go further and to speak with kindness and courtesy but still with earnestness and deep concern regarding the suspicions and distrust which the proposed overture expresses and the methods of meeting the great needs of the Cause of Christ today which it illustrates.

First, I wish I could persuade any who are in doubt, as to the true evangelical fidelity of the Board of Foreign Missions and of the foreign missionaries of our Church. I believe that both the Board and our missionaries have throughout our whole history faithfully represented the mind and heart of our Church and that they faithfully represent them today. I would recall the Statement which the Board issued on November 19, 1923, and its unequivocal declarations:

"All the members and officers of the Board clearly understand that having been appointed by the General Assembly as the authorized agency to represent the whole Church in its foreign missionary work, they should discharge the obligations imposed in entire obedience to the instructions of the General Assembly, and in full loyalty to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, and the whole system of doctrine contained therein. In these and in all other respects the Board has sought to administer the trust laid upon it by the General Assembly with absolute fidelity, and it is determined to hold this trust inviolate. The members of the Board are amenable in the matter of their fitness for service on the Board not to the Board but to the General Assembly, which is the sole judge of their competency. In case of misunderstanding or misapprehension members or officers of the Board concerned stand ready to give full account to the Church.

"All missionaries, prior to their appointment, are asked the following questions:

- 'Have you any religious views which you believe to be at variance with the teaching of the Presbyterian Church?
- 'Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord and Master?
- 'Is it your purpose to make such efforts the chief feature of your missionary career, no matter what other duties may be assigned to you?
- 'Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?
- 'Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?'

"No missionaries are appointed who cannot satisfactorily answer these questions. After appointment, all missionaries

are amenable to the missions to which they belong, and all ordained men to presbyteries as well. The Board has considered every definite complaint regarding missionaries, and has not found a single instance of unfaithfulness. If there is one missionary of the Board who is not true to the central doctrinal convictions of our Church, the Board does not know of him. If any one has evidence of the unfaithfulness of a missionary and will report it to the Board, the Board will deal with it at once in a constitutional way. While the Board is not an ecclesiastic body and cannot trench upon the jurisdiction of presbyteries over anyone's ecclesiastical standing in the Presbyterian Church, the Board is the judge of the qualifications of missionaries, and it deems sound views of the Gospel a vital qualification. The Board cannot withdraw confidence from devoted missionaries on the basis of impersonal and unsupported charges regarding unnamed and unidentified missionaries, and the Board believes that further rumors or suspicions should be resolutely discountenanced. Our missionaries have gone out from the heart and homes of the Church. Christian people who know them should silence false reports as to their character and consecration.

"Regarding union enterprises, which are said to be opening the door for unevangelical teaching by missionaries of other denominations, the demand for them has come from the field. The overwhelming need for colleges, seminaries, and medical schools, and the lack of funds to equip and maintain separate denominational institutions impelled our missions to join forces with other denominations in the interests of economy, efficiency and Christian unity. The Board calls attention to the facts: (1) That such union effort has been repeatedly and explicitly approved and advised by the General Assembly; (2) That the whole policy was carefully reviewed and reaffirmed by the Post War Conference of Missionaries in 1920, was referred to and unanimously concurred in by the 26 Missions at their annual meetings, and was then reported to and ratified by the General Assembly of 1922; (3) That such unions have been entered into only with sister evangelical churches which are recognized as such by the General Assembly; (4) That each case of union was reported at the time to the General Assembly. When a question arose regarding Chosen Christian College, the Assembly made an investigation through a special Commission which, after an inquiry extending through a year, reported unanimous approval of the institution to the General Assembly of 1921, which unanimously adopted the report; (5) That whenever difficulties and problems doctrinal or otherwise arise in connection with these institutions, it is the policy and purpose of the Board to take them up with the institution concerned and the Boards of the other denominations associated in it. If agreement cannot be reached on a strict evangelical basis, the Board will recommend withdrawal from further participation.

"The Board makes these statements in the hope that they will clear away any misapprehension that may be in the minds of some of the friends of missionary work. The Board entreats

the churches in the name of the General Assembly whose agency it is, in the name of faithful missionaries whose life work is menaced, and in the name of our Divine Lord and Saviour, to remember that withholding or diverting gifts penalizes not the members of the Board but the devoted missionaries and their work. It expresses the confident expectation that all Presbyterians who are loyal to the Church and to the great task that Christ has laid upon it will enlarge their missionary offerings so that the deficit may be completely wiped out and the needs of the work may be met."

Where the Board stood in 1923 it stands today. Its last declaration on March 20th, 1933, supplementing its declaration of November 21, 1932, regarding the Report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, was as follows:

"(1) That these Chapters (I-IV of the Report) do not conform to the fundamental aim of foreign missions as expressed in the Manual of the Board as follows:

'The supreme and controlling aim of Foreign Missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian Churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, self-governing; to cooperate so long as necessary, with these Churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen, and in bringing to bear on human life the spirit and principles of Christ.'

"(2) That the Board affirms its loyalty to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church and maintains the absolute finality, sufficiency, and universality of the Gospel of Christ.

This statement was adopted unanimously."

Ten years ago these same questionings which are implied in the proposed overture were abroad. At that time a member of the Presbytery in Illinois proposed an overture to the General Assembly with regard to Dr. George Alexander, who was then a member of the Board, asking for General Assembly action regarding him. This brother had no immediate knowledge of Dr. Alexander nor Dr. Alexander of him, but believing him to be a true Christian man, Dr. Alexander wrote telling him what he believed on the points which had been raised:

"At fourscore a man must take short views of the life that now is and seek to be not only at peace with God but, if possible, in perfect charity with all mankind....

"I was ordained to the ministry in the Old School, Presbyterian Church, January 20, 1870....

"I believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. I believe Jesus Christ to be the eternal Son of God, who became flesh and dwelt among us. That he was born of the Virgin Mary,

died for our sins according to the Scriptures, rose from the dead on the third day according to the Scriptures, ascended to Heaven, and will, in His own time, return to be our Judge.... The doctrine of the Virgin birth is to me very precious."

The brother to whom Dr. Alexander thus wrote at once withdrew his overture.

At the same time there were questionings regarding missionaries. Five Presbyteries sent an identical overture to the Assembly of 1921. These were referred to the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions which reported that "having heard all representatives of such Presbyteries as wished to appear before the Committee, and also having carefully examined all the material brought before us, your committee is gratified to report that it finds nothing to disturb the confidence of the General Assembly in the Board of Foreign Missions and in the great body of its loyal Christian missionaries." And the Assembly adopted this report.

Some years ago Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman and Dr. Ford C. Ottman after a trip around the world reported that they had found grounds for concern as to the position of some missionaries. Dr. Chapman had been a member of the Board and it at once invited him and Dr. Ottman to meet with it and to name any of our Presbyterian missionaries who might have occasioned their concern. They at once declared that there were none, that they had reference to no one in the Missions of our Church. In 1923 Dr. Robert Dick Wilson visited Japan, and Korea and China and also reported as Dr. Chapman and Dr. Ottman had done. The Board at once conferred with Dr. Wilson and he made the same declaration as the others. At the General Assembly of 1924 Dr. Wilson was a member of the Committee on Foreign Missions of which Dr. A. Gordon MacLennan was Chairman, and which contained a number of the most conservative ministers of our Church. Dr. Wilson testified before the Committee to the evangelical faithfulness of our missionaries and Dr. MacLennan reported among the resolutions of the Committee, which the Assembly adopted unanimously: "That the Board be commended for its care in the selection and appointment of Candidates for the Foreign Field and that they be requested to continue to exercise the most scrupulous care in this regard."

I would repeat the declaration of the Board in 1923: "If there is one missionary of the Board who is not true to the central doctrinal convictions of our Church, the Board does not know of him. If any one has evidence of the unfaithfulness of a missionary and will report it to the Board, the Board will deal with it at once in a constitutional way The Board cannot withdraw confidence from devoted missionaries on the basis of impersonal and unsupported charges regarding unnamed and unidentified missionaries, and the Board believes that further rumors or suspicions should be resolutely discountenanced. Our missionaries have gone out from the heart and homes of the Church. Christian people who know them should silence false reports as to their character and consecration."

In one respect this statement must be qualified. There are two instances out of nearly 1500 which are giving the Board concern, but it has strong hope that in each case the issue will be such as to glorify Christ by the winning and not the losing of lives.

Lastly, I wish I could win Dr. Machen and those who are of his mind to believe that our unities so vastly outweigh any disagreements that we ought in mutual, trust and real brotherly love to be working together for the one great end, in the service of our Divine Lord and Saviour. Not by suspicion and strife but by confidence and concord is the great work of our Redeemer to be done in the world by us who love Him, who believe in Him and His Cross and His Resurrection, and who have no desire except to know and teach His truth and to do His Will. I do not see how anyone can write out word for word, as I have just done in preparation for this statement, every passage in the New Testament dealing with the ideas of "variance", "strife", "contention", "division", "schism", "separation", "concord", "peace", "unity", "brotherly love", and weigh their sacred teaching, without hearing the clear admonition of Our Lord that we should stand together and work together in Him in the unity of His faith and love. What we need today is not conflict and division among us who hold this common faith but a united front against all that is opposed to Christ and His Gospel. Dr. Machen has shown us the kind of work that our time needs in his books on "The Origin of Paul's Religion," and "The Virgin Birth." It was by the latter that we were able to help one of our candidates who came rejoicingly, by the aid of it, to a rich faith in the One Supernatural Lord. And in such positive declarations of the great affirmations of the Gospel there is unity and peace. Here is the answer to the question of which Dr. Machen has written in beautiful words:

"Is there no refuge from strife? Is there no place for refreshing where a man can prepare for the battle of life? Is there no place where two or three can gather in Jesus' name, to forget for the moment all those things that divide nation from nation and race from race, to forget human pride, to forget the passions of war, to forget the puzzling problems of industrial strife, and to unite in overflowing gratitude at the foot of the Cross? If there be such a place, then that is the house of God and that the gate of heaven. And from under the threshold of that house will go forth a river that will revive the weary world."

That house is our Father's house wherein we dwell together in love and faith as brethren.

